This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

UC-NRLF
B 4 588 566
YD 263I7
Digitized by Google

GIFT OF
HORACE W. CARPENTIER

SIGILLVM · VNIVERSITATIS · CALIFORNIENSIS
FIAT LVX
MDCCCLXVIII

EX LIBRIS

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE ODES AND PSALMS OF SOLOMON

Digitized by Google

PUBLISHED FOR THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY AT

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS (H. M. McKECHNIE, Secretary)
12 LIME GROVE, OXFORD ROAD, MANCHESTER

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON: 39 PATERNOSTER ROW
NEW YORK: 443-449 FOURTH AVENUE AND THIRTIETH STREET
BOMBAY: 8 HORNBY ROAD
CALCUTTA: 6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET
MADRAS: 167 MOUNT ROAD

BERNARD QUARITCH LIMITED
11 GRAFTON STREET, NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

Digitized by Google

THE ODES AND PSALMS OF SOLOMON

RE-EDITED FOR

THE GOVERNORS OF
THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

BY

RENDEL HARRIS

AND

ALPHONSE MINGANA

VOL. II: THE TRANSLATION

WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

MANCHESTER: AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN & COMPANY, AND
BERNARD QUARITCH
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, MADRAS:
LONGMANS, GREEN & COMPANY

1920

Digitized by Google

BS1830
P7S8
1916
v.2

PRINTED AT OXFORD, ENGLAND
BY FREDERICK HALL
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

Carpenter

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

PREFACE

THE present volume contains the translation of the text of the Odes and Psalms of Solomon, as they are edited in the previous volume. A critical introduction is prefixed dealing with the main questions that affect the time and place of production of these Odes and Psalms and their interpretation, and accompanied by detailed notes to each of the Odes.

We have availed ourselves, as far as possible, of the great efflux of literature caused by the discovery of the Odes, but it has not been found practicable to give exact credit to everything that has been wisely said, nor is it consistent with the laws of charity to register all the mistakes of translation and interpretation that have been perpetrated by the various writers who have discoursed on the theme, including ourselves. We are sensible that much yet remains to be done in the explication of the Odes

442249

Digitized by Google

of Solomon, just as we are hopeful that a real advance will be registered in the present volume.

We hope, also, that the microscopic dissection of the text of these Odes, and the corresponding attempts to reach the mentality of their composer, will not wholly obliterate 'the first fine careless rapture' that accompanied their resurrection.

R. H.
A. M.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION:

I. The Identification of the Odes 1
II. Quotations of Odes in the Early Fathers . . . 16
III. Quotations of Odes in the Early Fathers (*continued*) . 40
IV. The Origin and Time of the Composition of the Odes . 61
V. Christ and Solomon 69
VI. The Christology of the Odes 72
VII. The Odes and the Biblical Targum 85
VIII. Style of the Odes 91
IX. The Style of the Odes and that of the Psalms of Solomon compared 106
X. The Biblical Quotations of the Odes . . . 110
XI. Poetry of the Odes 125
XII. Unity of the Odes 133
XIII. Syriac or Greek? 138
XIV. Syriac or Greek? (*continued*) 159
XV. The Coptic (Sahidic) Version 175
XVI. The Odes and Baptism 187
XVII. Harnack and the Odes 197
XVIII. Gnosticism in the Odes 203

THE ODES OF SOLOMON: Translation, with Critical and Expository Notes 207

THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON: Translation 410

CONCORDANCE TO THE ODES OF SOLOMON 435

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INDEX TO THE ODES OF SOLOMON . . . 455

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

The Identification of the Odes.

We have given in the previous volume a brief summary of the materials upon which this edition of the Odes and Psalms of Solomon is based; and it is not necessary to repeat the descriptions which are there presented. For the sake of historical completeness we repeat, however, the evidence for the identification of the new Odes with the lost book which the Early Church spoke of under the title of *The Odes of Solomon*. The identification is the more necessary since the beginning of these Odes and the ending of the Psalms of Solomon are missing in the Rylands MS., and in the Nitrian MS. the greater part of the book is wanting, including the opening and the close. Thus we are precluded from appealing to introductory matter or to an attached colophon which might have contained a reference to Solomon, or to the songs themselves as either Odes or Psalms.

We begin, obviously, with the recognition that the latter part of the book contains, nearly complete, the collection known to scholars as the Psalms of Solomon, a collection extant in Greek in a number of MSS., and thought by most scholars to be directly derived from a Hebrew original. These Psalms are eighteen in number, a volume to themselves, and our MSS. show that they have been attached to a similar collection of Syriac hymns, forty-two in number. No distinction is made in our MSS. between the two collections, which are numbered continuously and described

Digitized by Google

simply as Psalms. We are to show that the first forty-two hymns are the lost *Odes of Solomon*, and then we separate the two collections, and assign to them the titles of *Odes of Solomon* and *Psalms of Solomon* respectively: for it is certain that the two collections did not always stand together.

In the Codex Alexandrinus of the New Testament (Codex A) the index at the end of the MS. shows that there once stood in the volume the eighteen Psalms of Solomon, the close of the index being as follows:

Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου·
Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολὴ α΄.
Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολὴ β΄.
ὁμοῦ βιβλία —.
Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος ιη΄.

Here we see the Psalms of Solomon standing just outside the accepted Christian books of the New Testament in the very penumbra of canonicity. There is no evidence that the Odes of Solomon stood with them, though if we judged by the contents they are much nearer to the New Testament than their companions. At a later date we shall find the two collections fused together, with the priority given to the Psalms over the Odes.

Thus in the *Synopsis Sanctae Scripturae*, which passes under the name of Athanasius, though it belongs to a much later date (say the sixth century) we find after the enumeration of the *Antilcgomena* of the Old Testament as follows:

Σὺν ἐκείνοις δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἠρίθμηνται·
Μακκαβαϊκὰ βιβλία δ΄.
Πτολεμαικά.
Ψαλμοὶ καὶ ᾠδὴ Σολομῶντος.
Σώσαννα.

Here *ᾠδή* is clearly a misunderstanding for *ᾠδαί*, under the influence of the canonical *Song of Solomon*.

We turn in the next place to the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus,

Digitized by Google

Patriarch of Constantinople, in the ninth century, where we find as follows:

ὅσαι ἀντιλέγονται καὶ οὐκ ἐκκλησιάζονται·

> *Μακκαβαϊκὰ γ΄· στίχ· ͵ϛτ΄.*
> *Σοφία Σολομῶντος· στίχ· ͵αρ΄.*
> *Σοφία υἱοῦ τοῦ Σιράχ· στίχ· ͵βω΄.*
> *Ψαλμοὶ καὶ ᾠδὴ Σολομῶντος· στίχ· ͵βρ΄.*
> *Ἔσθηρ· στίχ· τν΄.*
> *Ἰουδίθ· στίχ· ͵αψ΄.*
> *Σώσαννα· στίχ· φ΄.*
> *Τωβίτ, ὁ καὶ Τωβίας· στίχ· ψ΄.*

In this list we again see the form *ᾠδή* for *ᾠδαί*: we edit the singular because it occurs in some MSS. of Nicephorus, and because it gives us evidence that these two book-lists have a common element; but we do not justify it as Zahn tried to do, by a reference to the LXX of 1 Kings viii. 53 (*οὐκ ἰδοὺ αὕτη γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῆς ᾠδῆς;*) it is clearly a mistake which has come down on two separate lines: the recognition of the error shows us, as Bernard points out, that we have to qualify our statement that the junction of the Psalms with the Odes may be dated in the sixth century. After all it may be earlier.

We observe that Nicephorus has given us the content of the joined Odes and Psalms as 2,100 verses. It is easy to show from the MSS. of the Psalms of Solomon extant in Greek that they were credited with a compass of 950 verses. Thus the proportion of the two books is:

Odes to Psalms as 1,150 to 950.
or as 23 to 19.

Now let us turn back to our MS. and we shall find as follows: at the beginning, three leaves are missing, the book being arranged in quires of ten leaves; these three leaves contained the first two Odes and the opening of the third Ode. The Odes then run continuously till the fourth quire, where they stop on the verso of the fourth leaf: this makes 34 leaves for the first group of songs in

Digitized by Google

the MS. Then we come to the known *Psalms of Solomon* for which we reckon 26 leaves, and if we estimate the space required for the missing portion, we may say that the Psalms occupied 28 leaves, and that the proportion between the two parts is Odes to Psalms as 34 to 28. This agrees closely with the estimate furnished by the Stichometries, being in each case a proportion of 1·2 to 1, which enables us to identify our first group of songs with the *Odes of Solomon* spoken of by ps.-Athanasius and Nicephorus.

Before we pass away from this part of the investigation we may find it important to note that there is a suspicion that both the Odes and the Psalms had been discarded from the canonical and deutero-canonical literature of the Church at Carthage at a very early date. The evidence is as follows: we possess a catalogue written in the year A.D. 359, and of North African origin, known as the Cheltenham Stichometry, from its discovery in the Phillipps Library at Cheltenham by Mommsen;[1] in this catalogue, the Salomonic writings are introduced as follows:

> 'Psalmi David CLI $\overline{\text{ver}}$ $\overline{\text{V}}$.
> Salomonis $\overline{\text{ver}}$ $\overline{\text{V}}$ D
> profetas maiores $\overline{\text{ver}}$ $\overline{\text{XVI}}$ CCCLXX. numero IIII.'

This is at first sight somewhat perplexing: it seems as if the Cheltenham list had only one book of Solomon, or several books reckoned as one, and that the total extent of this book or books is 5,500 verses. But, as Preuschen[2] has suggested, the real reckoning for Solomon has got into the next line, and we should read:

> 'Salomonis lib. V. ver $\overline{\text{VII}}$. CCCXX.
> profetas maiores numero IIII.'

If this restoration be correct we should have the Cheltenham list in evidence for five books of Solomon, but without any clue to the identification of the five books, or any means of comparison with the stichometry of the Psalms and Odes as given by Nicephorus.

[1] Sanday, in *Studia Biblica*: vol. iii. 217 sqq.
[2] Preuschen, *Analecta*, pp. 135 ff.

Digitized by Google

Now that Preuschen is correct as regards the numbers may be seen from the fact that the figure 7,320 agrees with the count which we find in the Vulgate MSS.[1] For here we have:

'Proverbs	1,740	verses.
Ecclesiastes	800	"
Canticles	280	"
Wisdom	1,700	"
Ecclesiasticus	2,800	"
Total	7,320	",'

This justifies Preuschen's restoration, and shows that five books of Solomon were reckoned amongst the canonical and semi-canonical books in North Africa in the middle of the fourth century, but *the Psalms and Odes of Solomon are not amongst the five.* The very same thing follows from the consideration of the list of canonical Scriptures contained in the Acts of the Council of Carthage in A.D. 397, for the entry in the list of canonical books,

'Salomonis libri quinque,'

can hardly be referred to any other grouping than that which we have already described. From this time onwards the tradition of the Church is steady that there are *five* books of Solomon. Thus we find in Innocentius, writing at the beginning of the fifth century:

> 'Prophetarum libri sexdecim, *Salomonis libri quinque*, Psalterium;'[2]

And in Cassiodorus, writing at the middle of the sixth century:[3]

> 'Psalterium librum unum; Salomonis libros quinque, i.e. Proverbia, Sapientiam, Ecclesiasticum, Ecclesiasten, Canticum Canticorum;'

and so in other places.

[1] Sanday, l.c., p. 266.
[2] *Ad Exsuperium* (Galland, *Bibl.*, vol. viii, pp. 561 ff.).
[3] *De instit. div. litt.*, cap. xiv.

Digitized by Google

Isidore of Seville, in the early part of the seventh century, divides the five Salomonic writings into groups of three and two respectively, and explains that the two which he detaches (Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus) were really the works of Jesus the son of Sirach, but have been credited to Solomon on the ground of style:[1]

> 'Duo quoque illi egregii et sanctae institutionis libelli, Sapientiam dico et alium qui vocatur Ecclesiasticus: qui dum dicantur a Iesu filio Sirach editi, tamen propter quandam eloquii similitudinem Salomonis titulo sunt praenotati.'[2]

We have been at some pains to show the persistence of the tradition of five books of Solomon in the Church, on account of its importance in regard to the question of the reception or the rejection of the Psalms and Odes of Solomon in the African Church. If they were ever extant in the Church of Carthage, it would seem that they were very early discarded, and perhaps by the authority of Cyprian himself; but we must not assume too hastily that either the Odes or the Psalms were extant in a Latin dress. We need not spend more time over this paleographical and statistical identification; and there are, as far as we know, no further references to the Psalms or Odes of Solomon in the lists of canonical books that have come down to us, unless there should be a cryptic allusion to them in the 'new book of Psalms written for Marcion', which the Muratorian Canon (sec. ii–iii) condemns, or the ψαλμοὶ ἰδιωτικοί which the Council of Laodicea (*c.* A.D. 360) prohibits from being used in the Church. In the latter case we have the opinion of John Zonaras in favour of the identification. But Zonaras in the twelfth century was probably, like ourselves, engaged in speculation. On the other hand, if we might describe ψαλμοὶ ἰδιωτικοί as meaning Psalms of personal experience, the term would exactly suit our collection of Odes.

We pass on, then, from catalogues of canonical books and their

[1] Isidore, *De ordine libb. S. Script.*, P. L. lxxxiii. 155 ff.

[2] For the persistence of the tradition as to the five Salomonic books see Nestle, *Zeitschrift f. alttest. Wiss.*, 1909, xxvii. 294 ff.

Digitized by Google

stichometry to the evidence furnished for the *Odes of Solomon* by actual patristic and quasi-patristic quotation.

We begin with a reference in the *Divine Institutes* of Lactantius, to which, as far as we know, the attention of English readers was first drawn by Whiston in his *Authentic Records*.[1] Here we find Lactantius saying in the fourth book[2] as follows:

> 'Salomon in Ode undevicesima ita dicit: Infirmatus est uterus Virginis et accepit foetum et gravata est, et facta est in multa miseratione mater virgo.'

Lactantius tells us to look for this passage in the 19th Ode of Solomon,[3] and we immediately verify this on turning to our text. The only discordance appears to be the first word *infirmatus*, which stands in the place of an obscure Syriac word, and is itself obscure in the meaning. Of this more presently.

Before the discovery of the actual text of the Odes had made this identification possible, it had been acutely suggested by Ryle and James, in their edition of the eighteen Psalms of Solomon, that the reference of Lactantius proved that at one time more Salomonic matter was available than the eighteen known Psalms; and that it was probable that the original collection of the *Psalms of Solomon* was fitted with an appendix of the *Odes of Solomon*, the added matter being approximately equal in length to the original collection, and either Christian or marked by distinctly Christian interpolations. This was a brilliant piece of divination. It was not, however, necessary that the supposed appendix should come last. Our text shows it in the front place. No doubt there are two traditions as regards the order, as we shall see more clearly presently.

[1] Vol. i. 155.

[2] *De Div. Inst.* iv. 12.

[3] There is no reason to doubt the reference which is in all MSS. of the apparatus of Brandt's edition: the number is wanting in the MS. Kk. 4. 17 of the Cambridge University Library, but is found in Gg. 4. 24 of the same collection. We must certainly edit 'undevicesima' in Lactantius's text: the fact that no number is given in the *Epitome* of the *Institutes* does not invalidate this conclusion. The number was not wanted in an *Epitome*.

Digitized by Google

It was not unnatural to infer from the existence of the aforesaid quotation in the beginning of the fourth century, taken along with the fact that Lactantius, when quoting Greek books, such as Hermes Trismegistus or the Sibyl, quotes in Greek and does not offer a translation, that the Odes were current in a Latin version at the date mentioned. Further examination throws grave doubt on the accuracy of this suggestion, On reading over the fourth book of Lactantius's *Institutes* we came to the conclusion that it was based throughout upon a volume of *Testimonia adversus Iudaeos*, agreeing closely with the treatment of Cyprian of the same theme, and that, in particular, the quotation about the Virgin Birth is one of the anti-Judaic extracts in the collection. We thus arrived in this examination at the same result as Pichon, in his study of Lactantius, who is followed pretty closely by Bernard in his introduction to the *Odes of Solomon*. The matter is so important in view of recent investigations, which confer an almost apostolic authority on the primitive collections of *Testimonia*, that we must examine the question more in detail.

Bernard, then, whose attention had been drawn to the matter by Lawlor, put the case as follows:

> 'In Pichon's study of Lactantius, it is pointed out that his Bible quotations do not exhibit any special familiarity with the Old Testament—he only became a Christian while living in Nicomedia—and Pichon thinks that he may have got them from a collection of *Testimonia* like Cyprian's. If this be a well-grounded opinion, we can understand how Lactantius, alone among the Fathers, Eastern or Western, could have made the mistake of quoting the Odes as genuine Solomonic prophecy. He did not accurately know the limits or contents of the Old Testament. Other Fathers may have known the Odes, and probably some of them did, but they knew that they were not Scripture, so they did not quote them.'
>
> 'The evidence, then, of Lactantius amounts to this—that the Odes were known, and were ascribed to Solomon before the year 305 in the district of Nicomedia. We cannot be sure of the existence of a Latin version, nor even whether Lactantius

Digitized by Google

had access to them in Greek or Syriac, but we can be sure that he counted them genuine writings of Solomon.'

We agree that there is no evidence for the existence of a Latin Version; there is, however, evidence for the existence of a Latin *Testimony Book*, containing one sentence of the Odes of Solomon. It is the composer of this *Testimony Book*, or the person who interpolated Solomon into it, to whom Bernard's remarks apply about his not knowing accurately the contents of the Old Testament. Thus Lactantius moves off the scene altogether, and we have instead to chase, and if possible to catch, the editor of the *Testimony Book* who is responsible for the insertion of the passage. To do this we must move into a much earlier time than Lactantius. We note in passing that if it can be established that Lactantius and Cyprian are using the same Latin collection of Testimonies, Cyprian has dropped the Odes from his tradition; this agrees with what we have shown above, that they were not a part of the canonical Scriptures at Carthage in Cyprian's day. But, if Cyprian dropped the passage, to what Father, at an earlier date, are we to credit their insertion? It is almost certain, as a result of recent investigations, that the *Testimony Book* in its earliest form antedates the New Testament, and is of Apostolic origin. How far back towards such an early origin does the quotation of Lactantius take us? The answers to these questions are of the first importance. We shall return to them again, when we come to discuss the date and authorship of the Odes in a subsequent chapter. For the present we content ourselves with stating the following positions:

(i) Lactantius in his fourth book of *Divine Institutes* is working from a *Testimony Book* as the foundation of his argument.

(ii) This *Testimony Book* was written in African Latin, and agrees closely with the *Testimonia* of Cyprian.

(iii) Where Lactantius diverges from Cyprian, as in the addition of uncanonical matter, it often happens that the divergent and additional matter will be found in Justin Martyr.

Digitized by Google

(iv) It is a reasonable inference from the foregoing that the common origin of *Testimonia* of Lactantius and Cyprian is earlier than the time of Justin Martyr.

Under the first head, which can be easily verified by a careful student, a detailed proof will be found in the recently published volume entitled *Testimonia*.[1] We note here the following points: the chapter in which Lactantius discourses of the Virgin Birth is headed editorially as follows:

> 'De Iesu ortu ex Virgine, de eius Vita, Morte, et Resurrectione; atque de iis rebus *testimonia Prophetarum*.'

The chapter opens as follows:

> 'Descendens itaque de caelo sanctus ille Spiritus Dei sanctam Virginem, cuius utero se insinuaret, elegit. At illa divino Spirito hausto repleta concepit, et sine ullo attactu viri repente virginalis uterus intumuit. Quod si animalia quaedam vento et aura concipere solere omnibus notum est, cur quisquam mirum putet, cum Spiritu Dei, cui facile est quicquid velit, gravatam esse Virginem dicimus? Quod sane incredibile posset videri, nisi hoc futurum *ante multa saecula Prophetae cecinissent*.'

It is clear from the foregoing that Lactantius is going to use *Testimonies from the Prophets* in proof of the Virgin Birth. He proceeds at once to the passage in the Odes, 'Solomon says in the nineteenth Ode', and then continues as follows:

> 'Item propheta Esaias, cuius verba sunt haec: Propter hoc dabit Deus ipse vobis signum. Ecce Virgo accipiet in utero et pariet filium, et vocabitis nomen eius Hemanuel.'

This is Cyprian, *Testimonies*, ii. 9. And that Lactantius is not only quoting prophets, but quoting them *adversus Iudaeos*, appears from what follows:

> 'Quid hoc manifestius dici potest? Legebant ista *Iudaei*, qui eum negaverunt.'

[1] *Testimonia*, by Rendel Harris and Vacher Burch (Cambridge University Press).

Digitized by Google

Very well, then: Lactantius quoted his passage from the Odes of Solomon by the way of a *Testimony Book* of an earlier day than his own, in which he found the Odes quoted as Solomon's, Solomon himself being numbered amongst the prophets. The introductory formulae:

> '*Salomon in ode undevicesima;*
> *Item Esaias;*'

are easily seen to be entirely in the manner of the *Testimony Book*.[1]

That the *Testimony Book* of Lactantius was in Latin, and of the Cyprianic type is seen by the fact that the editors use Lactantius's quotations to edit Cyprian by.

That Lactantius agrees with Justin in presenting an earlier type of quotation than Cyprian may be seen in a number of ways. Here is a single instance: in the eighteenth chapter of the fourth book, Lactantius quotes against the Jews a passage from Esdras:

> 'Apud Esdram ita scriptum erat:
> Hoc pascha Salvator noster est et refugium nostrum,' etc.

This unknown extract from Esdras is found again in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. 72:

> *Καὶ εἶπεν Ἔσδρας τῷ λαῷ·*
> *Τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν·*

and it is one of the passages which Justin says the Jews have removed from the Bible; an explanation which probably means that he used it as an argument from his *Testimony Book* and could not verify it from the Scriptures. The concurrence of Lactantius

[1] Having shown the origin of Lactantius's quotation, the force is taken out of attempts to find parallels to the Odes of Solomon elsewhere in Lactantius. The most striking parallel is in *De Divin. Instit.* iv. 26 'Is, qui humilis advenerat ut humilibus et infirmis opem ferret et omnibus spem salutis ostenderet, eo genere afficiendus fuit, quo humiles et infirmi solent, ne quis esset omnino, qui eum non posset imitari.' This makes a very good commentary on Ode vii. 4, 'Like my nature He became that I might put Him on', but is not to be taken as derived from it.

Digitized by Google

and Justin in anti-Judaic matter is significant. It appears, then, that as early as the first half of the second century, the Odes of Solomon could be quoted as a part of the *Old* Testament, and that at this date they passed as being the work of Solomon.

The next stage in the identification of the Odes is concerned with the fact that five of them are quoted in the curious Gnostic book which passes under the name of the *Pistis Sophia*, where they are definitely referred to Solomon, are evidently transcribed from the author's Biblical text, and in one instance the quoted Ode has a number from which important inferences may be made. These five Odes are printed in full in our previous volume, in the Sahidic language in which they occur, with the commentaries and explanations offered by the author of the *Pistis Sophia*, and we do not need to recapitulate the textual evidence. Neither is it necessary to discuss in detail the composition of this strange book, the wildest of all the productions of Gnosticism that are extant. It is sufficient for our purposes to remember that the unique MS. in which the *Pistis Sophia* is found is credited to the sixth century, and that the book itself can hardly be later in date than the end of the third century. At first sight, then, it appears to be the *terminus ad quem* for the Odes which it quotes; but we must remember what has resulted from our examination of the citation in Lactantius, that the passage in Lactantius is taken from a book of *Testimonies*, which are probably at least as early as the second century; so that the honour of the first chronological evidence for the Odes of Solomon does not any longer lie with the *Pistis Sophia*.

Let us now see the way in which the writer of the *Pistis Sophia* makes use of the Odes. His method consists in working out a game of question and answer between Jesus and the disciples (male and female) who are gathered round him on the Mount of Olives. The Saviour takes a Psalm of David, disguises it carefully by the substitution of Gnostic terms for the ordinary Biblical language, and then asks for the solution of the meaning and origin of the fantastic Scripture which he has manufactured. One or

Digitized by Google

other of the disciples solves the riddle, and recites the Psalm which has been perverted. We have in this way what has been described as a Gnostic Targum preceding the text that is Targumized. Then, after the solution has been found, the whole Psalm is sometimes gone over sentence by sentence with its parallel Gnostic equivalent; this is what may be called for convenience the Gnostic commentary. Psalm after Psalm of the Biblical Psalter is treated in this way, and then referred to its place in the Psalter and to the Davidic authorship, usually in a formula like the following:

> 'This is what your Light-Power (a substitute for the Divine Name) prophesied through David in the 69th Psalm.'

Intermingled with these Gnosticised Psalms of David, we have, as stated above, five Odes of Solomon similarly treated; and because the treatment is similar we are entitled to say that the author of the *Pistis Sophia* found the Salomonic matter in his Old Testament, where it ranked along with the Davidic Psalter. Let us see how he introduces them when they are identified by the disciples.

The first Ode is introduced as follows:

> 'Mary the mother of Jesus answered and said: My Lord, thy Power of Light prophesied aforetime in these words through *Solomon in his nineteenth Ode* and said: The Lord is on my head like a crown,' &c.

Here the reference to the 19th Ode shows that we have the missing first Ode of our collection, taken from a text in which the Odes were preceded by the eighteen Psalms of Solomon, and numbered continuously with them, only in the reverse order of the relative position of Psalms and Odes from what we find in the Syriac MSS.

The fifth Ode is introduced as follows:

> 'And it came to pass when Jesus had done speaking these words to His disciples, that Salome stepped forward and said: My Lord, my [? thy] Power constrains me to tell the solution of

Digitized by Google

the words which *Pistis Sophia* spake. Thy Power prophesied aforetime *through Solomon* and said: I will give thanks to thee, O Lord,' &c.

The sixth Ode is introduced as follows:

'Peter stepped forward and said: My Lord, as to the solution of the words which thou hast spoken, thy Power of Light prophesied aforetime through *Solomon in his Odes.*'

The 22nd Ode is introduced as follows:

'And the Prime Mystery (i.e. Jesus) answered and said: Matthew, I bid thee produce the solution of the hymn which *Pistis Sophia* uttered. And Matthew answered and said: As to the solution of the hymn which *Pistis Sophia* uttered, thy Power of Light prophesied aforetime in the *Ode of Solomon*; He who brought me down,' &c.

The 25th Ode is introduced as follows:

'And the Prime Mystery answered and said unto Thomas: I bid thee produce the solution of the hymn, which *Pistis Sophia* hymned upwards to me. And Thomas answered and said: My Lord, as to the hymn which *Pistis Sophia* uttered, when she was liberated from Chaos, thy Power of Light prophesied aforetime through Solomon the Son of David in his Odes: I was rescued from my bonds,' &c.

Over and above these references to the Odes, when they are discovered by the acuteness of the disciples, we have in the commentaries an occasional reference to the Salomonic authorship; e.g. in referring to Ode vi, Peter says:

'Listen, my Lord, I will utter the word boldly (ἐν παρρησίᾳ) after the fashion that thy power *prophesied through Solomon.*'

Referring to Ode xxii Matthew says:

'This, then, my Lord, is the solution of the hymn which *Pistis Sophia* uttered. Listen, then, I will recite it frankly. The word which thy Power *spake through Solomon,*' &c.

Digitized by Google

For Ode xxv Thomas is the speaker, who says:

> 'This, then, my Lord, is the solution of the Penitence which *Pistis Sophia* uttered, when she was freed from Chaos: listen, then, I will speak boldly (ἐν παρρησίᾳ): the word which thy Power of Light *spake through Solomon*; I was rescued from my bonds,' &c.

It will be seen that it is only in the first Ode that we have the number of the hymn given; fortunately for us it was so given, as it enabled us to restore the Ode to its right place. The author of the *Pistis Sophia* had been misled by the similarity in one of its sentences to the fifth Ode, and had attached them to the explanation of that Ode.

We have now shown that the author of the *Pistis Sophia* had the Odes in his Biblical text, preceded, in all probability, by the Psalms of Solomon, and like them, ascribed to Solomon. He uses them alternately with the Davidic Psalms as being of equal, or approximately equal authority. This is not, however, all that we discover from the use of the Canonical Psalms in the *Pistis Sophia*. About ten years before the discovery of the Odes Dr. Budge published the Sahidic Psalter in a complete form from a sixth-century papyrus MS. When we compare the text of the Psalms in the *Pistis Sophia* with that of this newly published Sahidic Psalter we find that they are the same text with microscopic variations.[1] Either the *Pistis Sophia* was written in Sahidic, and naturally employed the Sahidic Psalter, or the translator who turned the *Pistis Sophia* into Sahidic reverted to the Sahidic Psalter when he came to translate the Psalms which he found in his text. And as we have shown that the treatment of the Salomonic Odes and the Davidic Psalms in the *Pistis Sophia* is strictly parallel, we are entitled to infer with strong probability that the Odes of Solomon have also been taken from the Sahidic Bible. That is to say,

[1] Rahlfs has pointed out that this is not true of the Psalms xxx (xxxi), xxxiv (xxxv), li (lii), and cviii (cix), which show signs of independent translation; v. *infra*.

Digitized by Google

before the end of the third century, there was a Sahidic Bible, as well as a Greek Bible, containing both the Davidic Psalter and the Psalms and Odes of Solomon. The antiquity which this consideration assigns to the Odes in their first form must be very great.

Incidentally we have shown that the Sahidic Bible must be also earlier than the end of the third century. This is a distinct gain to our knowledge of the versions. When Professor Burkitt wrote his article on the Texts and Versions of the Bible for the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, he could only say that 'the Sahidic version is probably of considerable antiquity', and that it can be traced back to the early part of the fourth century. The suggestion which he made that the orthodox Psalter had been used by the writer of the *Pistis Sophia* to make his unorthodox matter more respectable is negatived by a careful reading of the book, in which the canonical Psalms are seen to be a necessary part of the argument throughout.

CHAPTER II

Quotations of Odes in the Early Fathers.

We may now pass on to the consideration of the traces of the Odes in the writings of the Fathers of the Church. We have already shown that the quotation made by Lactantius comes through the medium of a collection of *Testimonia* very similar to the *Testimonies* of Cyprian, and earlier in date than the latter. It need hardly be said that these *Testimonies* are not of Latin origin: they must be translations from either the Greek or some Oriental language. Thus we have no Latin evidence, as yet, for the Odes. When we turn to the Greek Fathers the poverty of evidence is almost as conspicuous. The only passage, as far as we know, in Greek Patristic literature that has yet been claimed

Digitized by Google

as a transference from the Odes is the introductory sentences of the catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, addressed to candidates for baptism, to which Dr. Bernard has drawn attention. It runs as follows:

> 'Already is there on you the savour of blessedness, O ye who are soon to be enlightened; already are you gathering spiritual flowers, to weave heavenly crowns withal; already hath the fragrance of the Holy Spirit refreshed you; already are you at the entrance hall of the King's house: may you be brought into it by the King! For now the blossoms of the trees have budded; may but the fruit likewise be perfected.'[1]

It must be recognized that there is some parallelism between this passage and the first Ode of our collection, in which we have an unfading crown of Truth which blossoms upon the head of the singer, and brings forth fruits that are full and perfect.

One might, perhaps, add a further parallel for the 'fragrance of the Holy Ghost' from Ode xi. 15:

> 'My nostrils had the pleasure
> Of the pleasant odour of the Lord.'

Dr. Bernard suggests that the first Ode had actually been sung before the delivery of the address to the Catechumens, and that Cyril's language was suggested to him by the song.

We shall return to the question of the supposed dependence of Cyril upon the Odes in a later chapter.

Meanwhile it is sufficient to state that we have not hitherto found any other passage in the Greek Fathers which has been claimed as evidence of a direct dependence upon the *Odes of Solomon*: we shall now turn farther east in search of parallels, after which we will return to the evidence of Greek Patristic literature.

When we pass from the Greek and Latin Churches and examine the Syriac literature, we come across indisputable traces of the

[1] Translated by J. H. Newman in *Library of the Fathers*.

Digitized by Google

Odes, both in the form of direct quotations and indirect allusions. Nothing definite can be found, as far as we know, in the pages of Aphrahat; but when we come to the works attributed to Ephrem Syrus we find ourselves in an atmosphere where the Odes are certainly at home. We use the expression 'works attributed to Ephrem' because we are obliged to recognize that a good many Syriac compositions bear his name without his authority, and thus acquire an artificial eminence. We may have to revise the mark of authorship in some cases; at present it stands for what it is worth. We are looking, in the first instance, for traces of the Odes in Syriac, and we find such traces in works attributed to Ephrem.

For example, here is a certain quotation from the Odes. In a series of discourses *on Paradise* Ephrem tells us:

> 'For nothing there is idle (*or* useless).'—*Ed. Rom.* iii. 584.

which is almost exactly the language of Ode xi. 23:

> 'There is abundant room in thy Paradise,
> And nothing is useless therein;
> But everything is filled with fruit.'

The Syriac of both is:

ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬ ܡܕܡ [ܒܦܪܕܝܣܐ] ܕܒܛܝܠ ܗܘ.—Ephrem.
ܘܠܝܬ [ܒܦܪܕܝܣܐ] ܡܕܡ ܕܒܛܝܠ.—*Ode Sol.*

In the same series of hymns we find that Ephrem has made explanation for us of an obscure passage in the same Ode:

> 'They have turned away the bitterness of the trees,
> When they were planted in thy land.'—Ode xi. 21.

To which apparently the following of Ephrem corresponds:

> 'The Devil caused the tares to grow
> that he might choke the fair plants;
> But the Blessed One in *His glorious Paradise*
> sweetens their bitterness.—*Ed. Rom.* iii. 588.

An almost exact quotation from and imitation of the 13th Ode ('Behold, the Lord is our mirror') occurs in Ephrem, who, by the

Digitized by Google

slightest change of ܡܪܝܐ (the Lord) into ܡܝ̈ܐ (water), with subsequent modification of the pronouns, tells us that 'the water (sc. of baptism) is a mirror'; the passage is as follows:

'The water! its nature is like a mirror
To him that scrutinizes therein;
Provoke thy soul, O elect one,
And become like to that in which thy own image was depicted.
Take from it a demonstration;
Fix thine eyes on baptism,
Clothe thyself with the beauty that is hidden in it.'

Eph., *Hymn in Fest. Epiph.* i. 93.

The parallels are obvious:

'The Lord is our mirror;
Open your eyes and see them in him:
. . . .
Love His holiness and clothe yourselves therewith.'

It seems probable that Ephrem has changed the 13th Ode in the interest of the ritual of baptism, and turned the most beautiful of all the songs in the collection into a very second-rate product.

The same use of the 'mirror' Ode may be detected in a passage in the *Hymns on the Church and on Virginity* ascribed to Ephrem:[1]

ܡܚܙܝܬܐ ܫܦܝܬܐ: ܕܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ ܠܥܡ̈ܡܐ:
ܩܢܘ ܥܝܢܐ ܟܣܝܬܐ: ܩܪܒܘ ܘܚܪܘ ܒܗ:
ܕܚܙܘ ܣܢܝܘܬܗܘܢ: ܒܣܪܘ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ:
ܡܘܡܝ̈ܗܘܢ ܡܪܩܘ ܒܗ: ܘܙܠܬ̈ܗܘܢ ܡܚܘ ܒܗ:
ܐܬܒܗܝ ܠܟܝ ܕܐܦ ܣܢܝܘܬܐ ܒܡܘܡܝ:
ܘܕܡܘܬܟܝ ܐܬܒܠܥ ܒܗ.

i.e. 'The pure mirror: which is set before the Gentiles: they have acquired the hidden eye: they have drawn near and gazed into it: and because they have seen their own hatefulness, they have reproached themselves: their blemishes they

[1] Ephr. (ed. Lamy), iv. 602.

Digitized by Google

have wiped away by it: their beauties have become fair by it. Blessed is he who reproves his own hatefulness by ⌜the sight of⌝ thy beauty: and on whom thou hast imprinted thy likeness.'

There can be no doubt that this section of the Hymn of Ephrem is based on the 13th Ode of Solomon (there is also an accessory parallel to Ode xv. 3, 'Eyes I have acquired', &c.). It becomes a matter of interest to inquire whether the Ode read in its first clause 'The Lord is our mirror' or 'The water is our mirror'. If we examine the composition of the poem from which our extract is taken, we see that it is a series of adorations addressed to Christ under various titles. For example, He is:

'The Treasurer of the Father',
'The High Priest',
'The Dew and the Hyssop',
'The treasure of the poor, and fountain of the thirsty',
'The rock upon which the Gentile Church is built',
'The Door of Truth',
'The refining furnace',
'The yoke that makes the bondman free',
'The pure mirror',
'The Vine',
'The Bread',
'The shipmaster who brings his ship to the haven'.

These titles of Christ show that it is Himself who is intended by the 'pure mirror', and that in Ephrem's book of Odes the 13th Ode began like ours. It is probable that the 'pure mirror' is an alternative form of the ἔσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον of the Wisdom of Solomon, in which case it certainly did not stand, in the first instance, for the water of baptism. That 'the Lord is our mirror' appears also from the reference to 'thy beauty', 'thy likeness'; cf. the language of the Ode, 'Love His holiness and clothe yourselves with it'.

Digitized by Google

The reader will hardly fail to note that in the successive stanzas of the hymn we have been considering, there are suggestions of further parallels with the Odes of Solomon.

For instance, we shall find that Christ is called the 'purifying dew'; this goes back to the Old Testament (Deut. xxii. 2, and elsewhere), and is a common figure in the Odes, 'Bedew us with thy dew', 'The dew of the Lord', &c. The 'gracious one who chose the Gentiles and tolerates their blemishes, because he receives the penitent', is the same Christ who in the Odes is Himself 'unpolluted by His love for the Gentiles, because they confessed Him in high places'. (See *Odes* iii. 10; xxxv. 1; x. 5.)

The Christ who is 'the rock upon which the Gentile Church is built', is the one referred to in Ode xxii. 12, as the 'Rock which is the foundation of everything, upon which thou didst build thy kingdom'.

The 'yoke that makes bondmen free' is illustrated by Ode xvii. 11, Ode xlii. 7, 8, 20. 'All my bondmen', 'my yoke over those that know me', 'they are free men, they are mine', and note the parallelism between, 'by thy aid he has led captive his captivity', and Ode x. 3, 'to lead captive a good captivity for freedom' (cf. Ps. lxviii. 18).

Last of all, there is the figure of Christ as the Shipmaster who brings his glorious ship out of the turbid sea to the haven of life and the haven of peace. The original of this is, of course, Psalm cvii. 30, 'So he bringeth them to their desired haven', 'they are glad because they are quiet'; but the proximate parallel is Ode xxxviii: 'the Truth led me and brought me ..... to the Haven of Salvation—the ascent of immortal life'.

It is Ephrem, then, who is responsible for reading 'water' instead of 'Lord' in the opening of the Ode. It is quite impossible to approve his correction, however attractive it may have seemed to a primitive exegete. Dr. Abbott was certainly right when he said that 'to emend "the Lord is our mirror" into "the water is our mirror" would be, in my judgement, to degrade a simple,

Digitized by Google

deep, noble and truly poetic conception into a (comparatively speaking) artificial, thin, and elaborate conceit'.[1]

Mr. Aytoun reminds us that Ephrem's language has affected Moses Bar Kepha in his tract on the *Mysteries of Baptism*, 'When thou lookest on the water thou seest in it another in thine own likeness—like thee. Here thou wilt perceive that thou goest down to baptism one person, and comest up another instead, the new instead of the old'. The same transference of ideas can be traced in other Syriac writers.

To return to Ephrem and his acquaintance with the Odes, which is the question upon which we are engaged.

In the very obscure 24th Ode, which appears to be a combination of the Baptism of our Lord with the story of the Flood and the descent into Hades, we are told that:

> 'The abysses were seeking for the Lord, as women in travail;
> And He was not given to them for food,
> Because He did not belong to them.'

If this is rightly understood of the descent into Hades, we have striking parallels to the starving abyss in the *Carmina Nisibena* of Ephrem, e.g.:

> 'I, Sheol, was fed upon the dead,
> Yes! I feasted upon corpses.
> Elijah slew the prophets of Baal,
> And gave me those who on the bread of Jezebel had waxed fat.
> The righteous had constrained me to devour,
> But Jesus compelled me to disgorge all I had eaten.'
>
> *Carm. Nisib.* 39, 18.

> 'Gluttonous death lamented and said, I have learned fasting which I used not to know ..... One man has closed my mouth, mine, who have closed the mouths of many.'—*Ibid.* 35, 8.

The suggestion is natural that the hungry Hades in Ode xxiv is the Abyss which cries in vain for food to the triumphant Lord who liberates the imprisoned souls. In that case we should have

[1] *Light on the Gospel*, p. 416.

Digitized by Google

a parallel between Ephrem and the Odes, which is not far from a dependence of the former upon the latter.

For another instance of the way in which Ephrem modifies the Ode from which he borrows, we may take the opening of the ninth Epiphany Hymn (i. 89), from which we took the reference furnished by 'the water':

'O John! who sawest the Spirit
Which dwelt on the head of the Son;
That She (the Spirit) might show that the head of heaven
Had descended and been baptised,
And (from the water) had gone up to be the head of earth;
You have therefore become children of the Holy Spirit.
Christ has become your head;
And you are become his members.'

Dr. Wensinck noted that the last two lines were parallel to Ode iii. 2, 'His members are with Him', and Ode xvii. 15, 'because they were members to me, and I was their head'; but he did not seem to notice that the opening sentences were based on Ode xxiv:

'The Dove flew over the head of the Messiah
Because He was her head.'

A couplet which was quite primitive in its unorthodox doctrine of the subordination of the Spirit to the Son. The play upon the word 'head' which occurs in Ephrem is due to the fact that he is trying to make the Ode which he borrows orthodox. He explains carefully that Christ is the head of heaven (*not* of the Spirit), and that he becomes the head of earth also, for are not believers His members? We may take it that Ephrem was acquainted with the 24th Ode, which he borrowed and modified.

The point which we have established is Ephrem's acquaintance with the Odes and his dependence upon them. This means that he had the Odes in a Syriac dress, for he did not know Greek, nor Greek literature, except as translated. Thus the Odes must have been extant in Syriac before the latter part of the fourth century.

The Syriac Odes known to Ephrem must have been the same Odes as have come down to ourselves.

Digitized by Google

A curious case of the dependence of Ephrem on the Odes may be noted in Ode xxxiv. 1, where Ephrem says:

'The way is easy for the simple' (Eph., *R. E.* ii. 486);

which is an obvious adaptation of

'No way is hard where there is a simple heart.'

In Ode xxxviii. 4 the expression

'Because it was and is the Truth'

appears to have been reflected on

'Because He was Truth which He (also) is' (Ephr., *R. E.* ii. 388).

The next step in the inquiry as to the Patristic attestation of the Odes is the discovery that Ephrem refers to the Manichaeans, or to Bardaisan the teacher of Mani (as he calls him), a belief that the sun and moon receive mutually light one from the other. Now this belief is involved in the language of Ode xvi. 17, where the meaning was not detected by the first editors of the Odes. Literally the passage runs:

> 'And by their reception one from the other, they (sc. the sun and the night) fill up (*or* speak) the beauty of God' (Ode xvi. 17);

with which we compare:[1]

'Let us say what they say,
But let us not assert what they assert.
They say that it is the sun who receives this light from
the moon:
Beautiful (ܢܐܝܢ) are these receivers,
Who receive one from the other,'

(ܕܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܕ)

which agrees closely with the Ode:

ܘܒܡܩܒܠܬܗܘܢ ܕܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܕ.

the subject being, as we suppose, the sun and moon in both cases.[2]

[1] Ephrem, *Second Discourse to Hypatius*, ed. Mitchell, p. 20.
[2] See the note attached to the Ode in question.

Digitized by Google

The last sentence about the beauty of the receivers is interpreted in an ironical sense by Mitchell, who translates:[1]

> 'Right worthy [an ironical exclamation] are these receiving vessels which receive from one another.'

It is not necessary to take the irony so far back in the text, and the translation of ܫܦܝܪ by 'right worthy' obscures the fact that the word is involved in the Ode, according to which 'by their receptions one from the other they fill up (*or* speak) the *beauty* of God'. Hence we translate '*Beautiful* are these receivers', and carry the expression back to Bardaisan, who is thus convicted again of an acquaintance with the Ode in question. The opening of the Ode has also something of Bardaisan about it in its references to 'the work of the steersman being the guidance of the ship':

ܘܥܒܕܗ ܕܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܗ ܕܐܠܦܐ.

for we have a similar expression attributed to Bardaisan in *De Fato*, c. 11:[2]

> 'We are not called upon to guide the ships, which only sailors know how to guide.'

ܘܠܐ ܕܢܕܒܪ ܐܠܦܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܠܚܐ ܗܘ ܕܒܠܚܘܕ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܡܕܒܪܘ.

It is not an unreasonable supposition that Ephrem is here quoting Bardaisan in the very language of our Odes; and it follows from this either that the Odes are Bardesanian in origin, or that Bardaisan himself used a Syriac text of the Odes coinciding closely with our own. In either case the antiquity of the Syriac Odes would be made out without contradiction. We, therefore, proceed to inquire whether there is any trace in the known teaching of Bardaisan of such a coincidence with the teaching of the Odes generally as we have just noted.

In order to make the inquiry without prejudice we have to remind ourselves that the net result of recent investigation into

[1] *Introd.*, p. xxxviii.
[2] *Patr. Syr.* ii. col. 552.

Digitized by Google

the character and teaching of Bardaisan, such an inquiry, for instance, as is made in the very adequate discussion which Abbé Nau has prefixed to his study of Bardaisan in the Syriac Patrology, leads directly to the conclusion that the character of Bardaisan has been systematically blackened by Ephrem, who connects him with the worst aberrations of the Manichaeans, and thus makes a typical Gnostic out of a man who was, in all probability, as good a Christian as himself. In his early days Bardaisan was a follower of the Babylonian astrology, and he himself admitted in his later days that he had been thus misled; it was, probably, his knowledge of astrology which, in the first instance, cast a shadow over his great name. Although the fragments of the Bardesanian tradition which have come down to us are scanty, enough remains to indicate important correspondences with the teaching and language of the Odes. For example, it has been often observed that the creed of the Odist was defective in the article of the Resurrection. The teaching of Bardaisan had the same lacuna.

It appears that Bardaisan and his school held dishonouring views of the Human Body as the seat of evil, and that they interpreted the Body as the Coat of Skin which the Soul has to shed. It is clear that they had a very strongly stated doctrine of the Coat of Skin, and Ephrem makes emphatic protest against it. The heretics whom he denounces talked of the 'intoxicating foulness of the body', and that it was 'a hateful harp which prevented the melody of Truth from being played upon its strings'.[1]

Ephrem protests nobly against this depreciation of the Human Body, and maintains that 'the Body is akin to all the beauties of the Soul, and a partner with it in all good things. By means of the Body the Soul preaches truth in all the world, and the Body is a pure harp for the Soul'.

Ephrem will not allow that the Soul has put on the Coat of Skin over itself. He expresses himself ironically: 'How pleasing it

[1] See Ephrem, *Fifth Discourse to Hypatius* (ed. Mitchell, pp. cii ff.).

Digitized by Google

must have been to the subtle nature of the Soul to put on the gross coat of the vile Body! For the Body is vile according to their account'. 'But', says Ephrem, 'it is not vile, because the Soul praises Him who clothed it with the rational covering of Intelligent Senses.'[1] Ephrem makes a similar reply to the Apostates who hold the doctrine that the Body is a vile 'Coat of Skin' to the Soul, by affirming that the Body is not necessarily impure, nor the Soul necessarily pure.

> 'For consider the pure and righteous Body, how it is not such as the Apostates state when they say "that the Body is a covering which is from the evil Nature", nor is the Soul, as they say, from a pure root. For the eyes of the glorious body clothe themselves with chastity, its ears with purity, its limbs with glory, its senses with holiness; in its mouth is praise, and on its tongue is thanksgiving, and on its lips is blessing,' &c.[2]

The protest which Ephrem makes against the doctrine of the 'Coat of Skin' is a noble one. It is not necessary to assume that the doctrine, in the form in which Ephrem denounces it, is the actual doctrine of the Odes. There has been an accentuation put upon the Odes, or upon some expressions in them, in a Gnostic direction.

It is quite clear from these references that the Coat of Skin and the Harp of the Spirit, which we find so often referred to in the Odes, were a part of the theological furniture of Bardaisan and his followers, and that Ephrem resents the interpretation which they have put upon the language of the Odist; for our present purpose the coincidences in language which are involved in the teaching of the Bardaisan school and the Odes are a further proof, if proof were needed, that the Odes were known in Edessa, and that they were in theological use in the system of Bardaisan and his congeners. The Coat of Skin had, according to their teaching, replaced the original Coat of Light; that was the story of the

[1] See Ephrem, *Fifth Discourse to Hypatius* (ed. Mitchell, p. cvi).
[2] Ibid., p. lxxi.

Digitized by Google

descent of the Soul into the gross material body. The Way of Life consists in finding again the original Robe of Light. We have some account of this in the *Hymn of the Soul* in the Acts of Thomas, where the Soul coming from its state of pre-existence goes down into Egypt and 'forgets the imperial palace whence it came', and the imperial robe in which it had been arrayed. It is significant that Ephrem in attacking Bardaisan finds fault with this very *Hymn of the Soul*. He says (*l. c.*, p. cvii):

> 'If the Soul *came from a place*, as they say, who know not what they say, how and why is it not able to return to its natural place? For if it was *sent forth when a child*, it was here that it received understanding,' &c.

The allusion here is to the opening verses of the *Hymn of the Soul*,[1] which may be taken on Ephrem's showing as Bardesanian, as had been conjectured on other grounds. We are, then, entitled to say that the doctrines of the Coat of Skin and the Robe of Light, which we find in the Odes, were known to Bardaisan. Thus the Odes must have been known in Edessa before the end of the second century.

A further parallelism between the ideas of Bardaisan and the Odist will be found in the 38th Ode. In this Ode Ephrem discourses at length on Error as a form of intoxication, which Evil produces in those who go astray. Thus he says (*Fifth Discourse to Hypatius*, p. cxv), that

> 'Those things which intoxicate us also take away our memory, so that in one respect the drunken ones who go astray are not blamed, for they do not know that they are assuredly going astray.'

We have only to compare with this *Ode* xxxviii. 12, 13:

> 'They invite many to the banquet,
> And give them to drink of their intoxicating wine;
> So that they vomit up their wisdom and intelligence,
> And the ⌜Deceivers⌝ deprive them of understanding.'

[1] 'When I was a little child and dwelling in my Kingdom in my Father's House', &c.

Digitized by Google

Dom Connolly has suggested with some hesitation that there is a quotation from the Odes in an extract from Moses Bar Kepha in a British Museum MS. The passages to be compared are these:

ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܠܬܚܬ. ܗܘܝܘ ܗܘ ܕܠܥܠ.

'The likeness of that which is below is that which is above;'
Ode Sol. xxxiv 4.

ܐܡܪܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܠܥܠ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܬܚܬ:

'For they say: The likeness of what is above are those things that are below.'—Moses Bar Kepha (*Exposition of the Jacobite Liturgy*), in Brit. Mus. Add. 21210, fol. 51 b.

Bar Kepha is explaining that the deacons with their fans represent the cherubim and seraphim, which is good enough allegory for the ninth century. Dom Connolly says that it is obvious that there is some close connexion between the two passages quoted above; but hesitates to claim dependence of Bar Kepha upon the Odes, on account of the ambiguity of the expression 'they say', with which Bar Kepha introduces the matter. We do not think he need have hesitated. It is almost certain that Bar Kepha is acquainted with the Odes in this passage and elsewhere.

We have stated in a previous passage that there had not been recognized up to the present time any quotations in the Odes in the writings of the Greek Fathers, unless we were to make an exception in favour of Cyril of Jerusalem and the prologue to his catechetical lectures. We are now going to show reason for believing that Eusebius of Caesarea was acquainted with the Odes.

In the tenth Book of his *Demonstratio Evangelica* (c. 8), Eusebius establishes the Messianic character of the 22nd Psalm, as shown by the agreement between its language and the Passion story in the Gospels. In the course of his argument he comes to the verse in which the Psalmist describes himself as surrounded by dogs and hemmed in by a congregation of evildoers. In the text of the LXX it runs thus:

ἐκύκλωσάν με κύνες πολλοί,
συναγωγὴ πονηρευομένων περιέσχον με.

Digitized by Google

The question naturally arises whether this text does not underlie the passage in the 28th Ode (v. 13), where the speaker says that

> 'They came round me like mad dogs,
> Who ignorantly attack their masters.'

Let us see whether this is more than an accidental coincidence.

Eusebius explains that the dogs in the Psalm are the assembly of the rulers of the Jews who sought for the blood of Christ. Isaiah had also called them dogs, stupid dogs, who did not know how to bark (Isa. lvi. 10). If they had been good dogs they would have known how to bark intelligently at the guardians of the spiritual flock of the house of Israel, and how to fawn upon and *to recognize their master* (ἐπιγινώσκοντας τὸν ἑαυτῶν δεσπότην) and chief shepherd; and they would have watchfully guarded the flock entrusted to them, and, if they had barked at all, it would have been at those who had evil designs upon the flock: instead of that, after the fashion *of dogs really stupid and mad* (ἐνεῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ μεμηνότων) they set up a howling, and drove wild the shepherd's sheep. There can be no doubt that in his comments on the 22nd Psalm Eusebius has made use of the 28th Ode of Solomon; for here we have not only the encircling dogs, but also the statement that they are mad and do not recognize their own master. Eusebius, therefore, knew the Odes, and it is also abundantly clear that the language of the Odes is borrowed from the 22nd Psalm, and that the speaker of the verses which we have been discussing must be Christ Himself.

And if we are satisfied that the Odist found his mad dogs in the 22nd Psalm, we shall be justified in reading in verse 17 of the Ode that

> 'Vainly did they cast lots against me';

for this is Psalm xxii. 18, 'upon my vesture did they cast lots'.

The personation of Christ by the Odist probably begins with the eighth verse:

> 'They who saw me marvelled at me,
> Because I was persecuted,' &c.

Digitized by Google

In that case, too, the statement that

'My birth was not like theirs'

is to be interpreted of the generation of Christ.

In the *editio princeps* it was remarked that 'perhaps the writer was speaking in these verses as if in the person of Christ'. The observation appears to be justified.

The same passage of the Psalms which we have expounded in Eusebius recurs in Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus, and with the very same explanation. Theodoret says that our Lord was surrounded by dogs and bulls, according to the Psalms: the bulls are the Jews who are, or should be, under the yoke of the law: they hand over our Lord to the unclean Gentiles, who pass under the name of dogs. After the Passion many of the dogs passed over into the rank of sons, and conversely: so that now the unbelieving Jews received the appellation of dogs because, after the fashion of dogs, they had *gone mad against the Master*:

τὴν κυνῶν προσηγορίαν ἐδέξαντο, ἅτε δὴ
κυνῶν δίκην κατὰ τοῦ δεσπότου λυσσήσαντες.

The concurrence of Eusebius and Theodoret in quoting the 22nd Psalm with the singular number for δεσπότης shows that we should correct the Syriac text of the Ode from ܡܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ to ܡܪܗܘܢ, and read that the dogs 'came unwittingly against their Master'. Labourt and Batiffol have, in fact, translated it so; 'comme des chiens enragés, ceux qui dans leur inconscience marchent contre leur Seigneur'. Flemming also corrected the plural to a singular.

In the *Prophetic Eclogues* (ii. 13) Eusebius treats the passage in the Psalm which speaks of the dogs and bulls as encircling our Lord, in an anti-Judaic manner; first, by asking definitely those who vaunt themselves of circumcision, who are the synagogue of evil doers here referred to? and next by answering his own question and saying:

> 'Certain evil and beast-like powers wrought out the plot against Him, on whose account He said that "Many bulls encircled me about: fat oxen hemmed me in"; and con-

Digitized by Google

> cerning the synagogue of circumcision that made onslaught against them, he said, "Many dogs encircled me, a synagogue of evil doers hemmed me in,"' &c.

There can be no doubt as to the place which the Psalm occupied in anti-Judaic theology. We note, in passing, the anti-Judaic accent in the Ode.

Having convicted Eusebius of the use of the Odes in the passage about the mad dogs, we may examine into one or two further coincidences of thought and language.

In the sixth book of the *Demonstratio Evangelica* (vi. 9, p. 267) Eusebius is arguing, as he does in a number of places, that the 'new song' of the Psalms of David and elsewhere is a prediction of the 'new covenant'. In the 144th Psalm, for instance, we have (1) the inquiry, 'What is man that thou art mindful of him?' (2) the appeal to God to *descend* from Heaven, 'Bow the heavens and *descend*, touch the mountains and they will smoke'; (3) the resolve of the Psalmist, 'I will sing a new song unto thee, O God'.

Here, says Eusebius, the Psalmist, 'who marvels at the knowledge of God the Word toward men, is in deep amaze over *His kindness*, by which He took a lower place than Deity, and *minished Himself* of *His* native *greatness*, and *made the human race worthy of His own knowledge*:'

> *Τὴν γὰρ εἰς ἀνθρώπους γνῶσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου θαυμάζων, ὑπερεκπλήττεται τῆς φιλανθρωπίας, δι' ἧς τῆς θεότητος ὑποβὰς καὶ τοῦ συμφυοῦς μεγέθους ἑαυτὸν σμικρύνας, ἠξίωσε τῆς ἰδίας γνώσεως τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος.*

Now if we compare with this the seventh Ode of Solomon we shall find the following sequence:

> 'He hath *caused me to know Himself* without grudging in His simplicity: because *His kindness has minished His greatness*.'—*Ode Sol.* vii. 3.

There can be little doubt that the language of Eusebius depends upon the Ode. It helps us to see that 'humbled' for ܐܙܥܪܬ 'minished' was an inadequate translation.

Digitized by Google

The same argument in a narrower compass will be found in the *Prophetic Eclogues* (ii. 14), where Eusebius tells that:

> 'In great amazement the Word says: "Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou regardest him?" For to this very end the Word of God bowed the so-called heavens and descended, in order that He might be known to the race of men to have become incarnate, though He was previously unknown to them.'

When we compare this sentence with the preceding, and with the language of the seventh Ode we can have no doubt that all these passages are connected *inter se* by the language of the Psalm, and that Eusebius's comments on the Psalm involve the language of the Ode.

Our next example is from the tenth book of the *Demonstratio* (*D. E.* x. 8, p. 499), where Eusebius discourses in detail on the prophecies of the Lord's suffering and death which are contained in the 22nd Psalm. When he comes to the verses in which Christ speaks to the Father as *the one who drew me forth from the womb*, and was my hope upon my mother's breasts, he remarks that the Lord recalled those early days of Divine care for a consolation in His last agonies, and he represents the Messiah as saying:

> 'Just as thou wast my help when I assumed a human body, when from the womb of her that bare me, thou thyself, my God and Father, *as if playing the midwife's part*, didst draw forth from the womb that flesh which had been prepared for me of the Holy Ghost,' &c.

in which we see that God the Father is described obstetrically, in harmony with the language of the Psalm, 'Thou art he that didst draw me forth from the womb'. But this is precisely what is said in the 19th Ode:

> 'She had not required a midwife;
> For He (*sc.* the Father) was midwife to her.'

Thus there is no doubt that Eusebius has the 19th Ode in mind: that is shown by the use of the word *μαιούμενος* (acting the

Digitized by Google

midwife) as well as by the coincidence in thought: but both Eusebius and the Odist are ultimately drawing on Psalm xxii.

The identification is an important one, as the passage in the 19th Ode was thought by Mingana to be decisive as to the Syriac origin of the Odes, on account of the underlying play on the senses of the word ܚܝܠܐ: but of this more elsewhere.

The 19th Ode has now been shown conclusively to involve the Virgin Birth, and a Divine accoucheur, and a painless delivery. So that if the Odes are from one hand the writer must have held the fully developed doctrine of the miraculous birth.

In the *Prophetic Eclogues* (ii. 13) Eusebius discusses the 22nd Psalm and its reference to our Lord. He says that it is matter of general consent among believers that the opening words refer to Christ, for they are the words from the Cross: then he says, in a striking and anti-Judaic manner:

> 'Before we begin to take over the prophecy of the Psalm as relating to Him, we will first inquire of those who vaunt themselves over circumcision, Who is the speaker in the Psalm? for it can hardly be an ordinary person who, *inter alia*, says the words, "Thou art He that didst draw me from my mother's womb," &c. It was to Christ, Christ alone, that it was appropriate to use such words to the Father.'

Here Eusebius fastens upon the birth-care of God as something outside ordinary life and faith, in a way that shows him to have in the *Prophetic Eclogues* the same idea of the miraculous birth as in the *Demonstratio*.

It is interesting, in this point of view, to notice that the very next page of the chapter of the tenth book of the *Demonstratio* has significant language regarding the supernatural birth of Christ, which can be paralleled in another of the Odes, from which it is probably derived. Eusebius (*D. E.* ix. 8, p. 500), continuing his comments on the verse of the 22nd Psalm, says:

> '"Thou didst cause me to hope when I was upon my mother's breasts", makes our Lord say on the Cross that "it is not now for the first time that I begin to hope in Thee,

Digitized by Google

but when I drew my infant nourishment from my mother's breasts, I was thought to be, like human babes, an imperfect and irrational being; yet I was not so, for even though my body was like other men's, yet it did not resemble the general in regard to power or essenec," &c.'

'Ἐνομιζόμην ὁμοίως τοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων βρέφεσιν ἀτελὴς εἶναι καὶ ἄλογος· μὴ ὢν γὰρ τοιοῦτος, εἰ καὶ σῶμα μοι ὅμοιον ἀνθρώποις ἦν, ἀλλὰ οὐ κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν οὐδὲ τὴν οὐσίαν τοῖς πολλοῖς ὢν ἐμφερὴς κτέ.

This is closely parallel to Ode xxviii, v. 16, 'I did not perish, for I was not their brother, *nor was my birth like theirs*'.

In the very same section Eusebius discourses of the descent of the Messiah into Hades, and his language is either borrowed from the Odes, or helps us to understand the meaning of the language of the Odes in obscure passages. For example (*D. E.* x. 8, p. 501) he tells how Christ descended into Hades, breaking the brazen doors and smashing the iron bars, and setting at liberty those who had aforetime been the bondsmen of Hades. With this last expression we may compare the closing words of the 42nd Ode: 'they are free men and they are mine'.

In the same 42nd Ode there is a curious expression, where the Lord, descending into Hades, is said to have been *gall and bitterness* to it. This is borrowed from the passage in Isaiah, where the fall of Lucifer is described: in the language of the LXX:

'Hades from beneath was embittered on meeting thee.'

'Ο ᾄδης κάτωθεν ἐπικράνθη συναντήσας σοι.—Isa. xiv. 9.

The objection might be made that the description of the fallen Lucifer is not a suitable parallel for the descending Christ: but this objection is met for us by Eusebius who speaks (*D. E.* x. 8, p. 503) of the angry demons crowding round Jesus like birds of prey, *just as they did round Lucifer* in the passage from Isaiah.

If we must not say that Eusebius is here reminiscent of the 42nd Ode, we may say that his language helps us to find the passage in the Old Testament that has influenced the Odist.

Digitized by Google

As the Peshiṭta version of Isaiah here follows the Greek, and not the Hebrew, we cannot draw any conclusions as to the original language of the Odes. The recognition of the dependence of Eusebius on the Odes is an important strategic point gained in their interpretation. *Inter alia* we see that the Odes like the *Demonstratio Evangelica* are occupied with the interpretation of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and especially with the Psalms. Among the Psalms it is evident that the 22nd Psalm had been an especial object of study: Eusebius devotes nearly a whole book to its Messianic prophecies; and the Odist has also studied it carefully, since he took from it the reference to the 'mad dogs', to the 'casting of lots', and to the miraculous accouchement of the Virgin. This Psalm, then, must have had a larger place among the primitive anti-Judaic *Testimonies* than we should, perhaps, have suspected; an examination of Cyprian's *Testimonies* shows four extracts from the Psalm, but not the reference to the mad dogs, nor to the miraculous birth. Gregory of Nyssa has the 'mad dog' passage, and some of the Cyprianic matter in a form that is archaic and anti-Judaic. Enough has been said to emphasize the connexion between Eusebius and the Odes, and between both of them and the primitive anti-Judaic *Testimonies.*

The discovery of the Eusebian use of the seventh Ode enables us to take a further step in another direction.

In the *Acts of Thomas*, in the story of the Wild Ass that talked to the Apostle, we have a kind of doxology to Jesus into which Judas Thomas breaks out, in which occurs the following expression:

Δόξα τῇ μεγαλωσύνῃ σου
τῇ δι' ἡμᾶς σμικρυνθείᾳ.
Acta Thomae, ed. Bonnet, p. 195.

the parallelism of the language to that of Eusebius invites attention: but as the Greek of the *Acts* is not the original, we turn to the Syriac and find the words that have been translated:

ܫܘܒܚܐ ܠܪܒܘܬܟ ܕܐܬܡܟܟܬ ܡܛܠܬܢ.
Acta Thomae, ed. Wright, p. ܪܦܓ.

Digitized by Google

> i. e. 'Glory to thy greatness which for our sakes was minished.'

which agrees closely with the language of the Ode, and is based upon it, just as the language of Eusebius is derived from the Ode on the Greek side.

We are able in this way to add another witness to the Syrian attestation, and it is very early testimony indeed, for every one is agreed to place the *Acts of Thomas* among the earlest remains of Syriac literature.[1]

As we have, in the course of our inquiry into Greek Patristic quotations from the Odes, stumbled upon a parallel in the *Acts of Thomas*, it may be thought worth while to add a few further remarks on the existence of other traces of the use of the Odes by the author of the *Acta*. It is probable that these Acts belong to the cycle of Bardesanian literature, and in particular that the *Hymn of the Soul* which is embedded in the *Acts* is itself Bardesanian and earlier in date than the first quarter of the third century. Thus the evidence, if we find any further coincidences, takes rank very nearly with the references in Bardaisan which we had already recovered; and the evidence will be especially valuable if it should come from incorporated hymns, which may be much earlier in date than the main body of the book. For example, when Judas Thomas

[1] The quotation was first recognized by Stölten in his *Gnostische Parallelen zu den Oden Salomos*, p. 36. Stölten, working from Bonnet's Greek text, thought he had found a further parallel in a passage in the *First Act of Thomas*, where Jesus is addressed as

> Ὁ σεαυτὸν εὐτελίσας ἕως ἐμοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς σμικρότητος, ἵνα ἐμὲ τῇ μεγαλωσύνῃ παράστησας ἑνώσῃς σεαυτῷ.—*Acta Thomae*, ed. Bonnet, p. 121.

But here the parallel is not so close as in the former case. The Syriac is:

ܕܐܬܡܟܟܬ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܒܨܝܪܘܬܝ ܕܢܡܛܐ ܠܪܒܘܬܗ ܕܝܠܗ.

> 'Who hast let thyself down even to my littleness, that we might attain to His greatness.'—*Acta Thomae*, ed. Wright, p. ܩܟܐ.

This is, however, no nearer to the Odes than the Greek, and like nine out of ten of Stölten's parallels may safely be set aside as irrelevant.

Digitized by Google

comes to the wedding of the King's daughter, he sings an epithalamium of his own, in praise of the Church as the Bride of Christ, and says of her that

> 'On her head dwelleth[1] the King,
> Who feedeth his dwellers that are beneath;
> Truth is placed on her head.'

The conjunction of these clauses is in exact parallelism with

> 'The Lord is on my head like a crown:
> . . . .
> The crown of Truth was woven for me.'—*Ode Sol.* i. 2.

and makes it clear that the *Acta* are quoting the Odes. The identification is important, as it confirms what we suspected from other considerations, that the first Ode of Solomon is of the nature of an epithalamium. The crown, moreover, is emphasized as being *Truth*, just as it is said to be in the ninth *Ode of Solomon*:

> 'An everlasting crown is Truth,
> Blessed are they that put it on their head.'—*Ode Sol.* ix. 8.

There is still a question to be solved as to the ultimate meaning of such a statement as 'the Lord is on my head like a crown'. The best parallel that has yet been suggested is the description of

[1] The Greek translator missed the meaning of ܫܪܐ in

ܒܪܫܗ ܫܪܐ ܡܠܟܐ.

and, supposing the root to be ܫܪ, rendered it

ἐν τῇ κορυφῇ ἵδρυται ὁ βασιλεύς.

He made a similar mistake on p. ܩܦܛ, where he rendered

ܬܐ ܫܪܝ ܥܠ ܡܫܚܐ ܗܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܪܝܬ ܥܠ ܩܝܣܐ:

'Come, dwell on this unguent as thou didst dwell on the tree'

by *ἐνιδρύσθω τῷ ἐλαίῳ τούτῳ ὥσπερ ἱδρύνθη*
ἐν τῷ συγγενεῖ αὐτῷ ξύλῳ ἡ τότε αὐτοῦ δύναμις.

Digitized by Google

the high-priestly dress in *Sap. Sol.* xviii. 24, where the *πέταλον* is termed

μεγαλωσύνη σου ἐπὶ διαδήματος κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ,

where *μεγαλωσύνη* is the Incommunicable Name. The language would be appropriate to St. John at all events: for the early Church had a tradition that he used to wear the *πέταλον*, as if he were a high priest.[1]

The first Ode, then, is involved in the first of the Hymns in the *Acts of Thomas*. Now let us see whether we can find any traces of the 42nd Ode.

The *editio secunda* had already suggested that a parallel to Ode xlii. 18,

'It was not able to endure my face',

might be found in the *Acts of Thomas* in the words:

Οὗ τὴν θέαν οὐκ ἤνεγκαν οἱ τοῦ θανάτου ἄρχοντες.
(ed. Bonnet, p. 265);

where the Syriac has the singular 'ruler of death':

ܘܠܐ ܐܫܟܚ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܠܡܣܝܒܪܘ.
(ed. Wright, p. ܫܡܚ);

but does not say what it was that 'the ruler of Death was unable to bear'; probably the words, 'my face', have dropped from the text.[2] It is possible that an object to the verb is missing: Wright adds a general object 'it' in brackets. Notice that with the exception of the missing object, the Syriac of the Ode is very close to the *Acta*:

ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܐܫܟܚ ܠܡܣܝܒܪܘ.

Certainly the one text is dependent on the other.

So we prove the book of *Odes*, from its first Ode to its forty-

[1] Batiffol also compares Proverbs iv. 9:

'[Wisdom] shall put on thy head a crown of grace.'

[2] Vision is implied in the previous clause:

'The dead saw thee and became alive.'

'It' is therefore what the dead saw.

Digitized by Google

second, to be available for the author of the *Acta Thomae* unless it can be shown that there is interpolation in the series of the Odes.

Further traces of the use of the 42nd Ode may be seen in the prayer of Judas Thomas in the bride-chamber in the first Act.

We may compare:

> 'Thou didst descend to Sheol and go to its uttermost end';
> *Acta Thomae*, p. ܩܣ.

with

> 'I descended with him to the extreme of its depth.'—*Ode* xlii. 12.

And:

> 'Thou didst open its gates and bring up its prisoners',
> *Acta Thomae*, ibid.

with

> 'Bring us out from the bonds of darkness, and open to us the gate by which we may come out to thee.'—*Ode* xlii. 16, 17.

CHAPTER III

Quotations of Odes in the Early Fathers (*continued*).

We come now to a very obscure passage in the Odes, where by a slight emendation the text can be reduced to intelligibility, and, perhaps, dependence upon the Odist can be established on the part of one of the earliest Christian Fathers.

In the 38th Ode we have a story of the triumph of the Odist over the wiles of heresy, perhaps as represented in the persons of a male and female heretic. From the allurements of heresy and the witchcrafts of error the writer is preserved by the Truth which goes with him, and which exposes to him the sophistries and dangers of the aberrant teaching. The Ode says obscurely, according to the rendering of the *editio princeps*:

> '(The Truth) made clear to me all the poisons of error and the plagues which announce the fear of death.'

Digitized by Google

For this the second edition substituted:

> 'And the plagues of death which they think to be sweetness.'

Here a slight change has been made in the order of the words,[1] and an attempt was also made, following the suggestion of Ungnad and Stärk, to restore ܕܚܠܝܘܬܐ ('sweetness') of the MS. for ܕܚܠܬܐ ('fear'). This correction is confirmed by the Nitrian MS. The sense, however, is still obscure; for what meaning can be attached to the 'sweetness of death', and how could the 'plagues of death be thought to be sweetness', without a strong margin being allowed to the imagination as interpreter of obscure readings?

Our suggestion now is that we follow the reading of the MSS., with a possible displacement of the word 'death', and see what can be done to reduce to intelligibility the sentence:

> 'All the poisons (*or* medicaments) of error, and the plagues of death, which they think (*or* which are supposed) to be sweetness.'

A little lower in the Ode we are told that the teachers of error operate upon their victims with intoxicating wine; and the suggestion arises that the deadly poison has been introduced into the wine, and that the wine thus drugged has been sweetened with honey. The victims think they are drinking *οἰνόμελι*: and a reference to the Syriac Lexicon of Brockelmann will show that the Syriac word for 'wine sweetened with honey' is ܚܠܘܐ, which is very near in form and meaning to the 'sweetness' of the MS.

The very word ܚܠܝܘܬܐ in our MSS. can, in fact, be taken to mean 'sweet drink'. Ephrem, in attacking Bardaisan and his heresies, uses the same figure and the same expression as the Odes. He says that Bardaisan, in composing his Psalter in imitation of David, was 'administering to the simple bitters in ܚܠܝܘܬܐ'. Here

[1] The Syriac tolerates the detachment of the words which we throw into connexion. 'Plagues of death' are the same thing, of course, as 'deadly plagues'.

Digitized by Google

ܚܠܝܘܬܐ is not merely 'sweetness', but something with which the poison is taken, i. e. a sweet drink. It would naturally be equated with the Greek *οἰνόμελι*:

ܐܝܟ ܠܡܣܡ̈ܢܐ ܡܙܓܐ ܒܚܠܝܘܬܐ:

Ephr. *R. E.* ii. 553 F.

We thus are able to read the sentence in the Ode thus:

> 'All the drugs of Error and the plagues of death which they think to be honey-wine.'

Now let us turn to the Ignatian Epistles: in his letter to the *Trallians* (chap. 6) Ignatius warns the Church against those heretics who are mingling poison with Christ, and who give, as it were, some deadly drug along with honey-wine (*οἰνομέλιτι*), which the unwary receives with delight (and along with his evil delight, receives death [1]). Here, then, we have the very same sequence of ideas as in the Odes, erroneous teaching mingled with truth, like poisonous, deadly drugs in honey-wine.

So we suggest that the Syriac of the Odes has been trying to translate *οἰνόμελι* (or conversely), and has given a rendering (or a vocable) very similar to that in the *Geoponica* to which Brockelmann refers.

If this be the case we shall be almost obliged to admit that the *Ignatian Epistles have incorporated a quotation or the equivalent of a quotation from the Odes of Solomon.*

If this can be maintained we ought to be able to take certain further steps: in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans (chap. 7) the prospective martyr speaks of the decline of his natural passions, and of his attachment to the Cross, and says that within him the living water is talking and saying 'Come to the Father'. The water is oracular, like that of the fountain of Daphne, with which the writer was familiar. For the *ὕδωρ ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν* Lightfoot argues that we ought to read *ὕδωρ ζῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενον*, and so to

[1] Greek text somewhat obscure at the end.

Digitized by Google

make connexion with the Gospel of John (iv. 14). The reader is referred to the note in the *editio princeps* (pp. 47, 48), in which it was maintained that Lightfoot's view was untenable, and it was concluded that 'our seventh Ode showed the fitness of the Ignatian expression, but that it was not necessary to assume any connection, either of place or authorship, with the Ignatian letters'. The coincidence of language was established, but not pressed. In view, however, of the possible use of the 38th Ode by Ignatius, the coincidence between the 11th Ode (verse 6) and Ignatius *ad Rom.* (chap. 7) may be more than accidental.

The coincidences between the Ignatian Epistles and the Odes are deserving of further attention. Assuming that we are correct in finding in the Odes the Ignatian 'oenomel' into which drugs are put, and assuming that the reference to the 'talking water' is a genuine parallel, we have to ask what is the meaning of these coincidences. If the oracular water is that of the sacred spring at Daphne, as has been suggested by writers on the Ignatian Epistles, the use of the figure for spiritual inspiration might be Ignatius's own. In that case, what of the Odes? Do they copy Ignatius's language? That seems very unlikely. If the 'oenomel' is a correct parallel, it is surely original with the Odist, for it is far more likely that Ignatius, writing letters rapidly on his western journey, should quote the Hymn-book of the time, than that the early Hymn-book should have picked up an obscure passage in a letter which had hardly got into circulation at a very early date.

What shall we say? Is it possible that the Odist is himself Ignatius? It is well known that there is a tradition in the Church that Ignatius taught the Antiochenes their hymns, that is, that he composed them, words and music. The passage is as follows:

> 'We must also tell whence the custom of the Church of singing antiphonal hymns had its origin. Ignatius, the third bishop after Peter of the Syrian Antioch, who also had personal intercourse with the Apostles themselves, saw a vision of angels praising the Trinity in Antiphonal hymns, and

Digitized by Google

delivered the fashion of the vision to the church in Antioch: from whence also the same tradition was transmitted to other churches.'—Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 8.

This is the earliest evidence, dating from the middle of the fifth century, for the tradition of Ignatius and his vision of the angelic choirs. Lightfoot points out that it is repeated by later writers, chiefly Syrian, such as Solomon of Bassora, Gregory Bar Hebraeus, Nicephorus Callistus, and Amr of Ṭirhān, and says that 'a tradition which appears so late (as the time of Socrates the historian) does not deserve consideration, as containing any element of historical fact'; and that 'antiphonal singing did not need to be suggested by a heavenly vision'. Well, suppose we let the vision go. The tradition, if it has an historical nucleus at all, can hardly be reduced to less than the existence of an Antiochene antiphonal hymn-book and some possible connexion of Ignatius with the same.

Let us see if we can find any further coincidences of language. In Ode VI we have the following expression:

> 'Blessed are those *ministers* (διάκονοι) who are *entrusted* with that water of His.'

Here there is no need to take the term 'ministers' in an ecclesiastical sense, as limited to a third order. In Ignatius we find the following passage:

> *τῶν διακόνων τῶν ἐμοὶ γλυκυτάτων πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—Ad Magn. 6.*

Here we get the same idea of ministers *entrusted* with ministry, but it is of the formal diaconate that the writer is speaking; he has already referred to bishops and presbyters.

In writing to the Philadelphians, Ignatius asks them to select a special minister, to carry a message to Antioch:

> *χειροτονῆσαι διάκονον . . . . . μακάριος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὃς καταξιωθήσεται τῆς τοιαύτης διακονίας.—Ad Phil.* 10.

Digitized by Google

Here the deacon elected is a kind of superfluous officer, chosen for a particular service. He is described as *μακάριος*, as in the Odes, and he is happy in being *counted worthy* of his ministry, which is very near to the *πεπιστευμένος* of the former passage of the Odes. Taking the two passages together it looks as if Ignatius had the language of the Ode in his mind when he was writing.

In Ode VII, 21 we are told that 'ignorance hath been dissipated because the knowledge of the Lord hath arrived'. This curious statement about the 'dissipation or destruction of ignorance' has a parallel in the epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians:

> 'Ignorance was dissipated, the ancient kingdom was destroyed, when God was manifested as man for the renewal of eternal life.'—*Ad Eph.* 19.

There is a certain degree of parallelism here; but if there is any connexion the priority is with the rhythmic sequence of the Ode.

In Ode XVII, 10, 11 we have Christ speaking:

> 'Nothing appeared closed to me:
> Because *I was the door* of everything:
> And I went towards *all my bondsmen to loose them.*'

In the Epistle to the Philadelphians, Ignatius says that

> 'Christ Jesus shall *loose* from you *every bond*' (*Ad Phil.* 8),

and this is followed by the statement that

> '*He is the door* of the father, by which enter Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the prophets and the apostles and the Church.'—*Ad Phil.* 9.

that is, Jesus Christ is the door *of everybody*, which is an explanation of the '*door of everything*' in the Ode. Somewhat in the same way, Ignatius has modified 'all my bondsmen', to 'all your bonds'.

It certainly is suspicious that we find these parallelisms: they invite the belief that Ignatius knew the Odes closely.

Reviewing the group of passages, whose degree of parallelism we have to estimate, we may, perhaps, find sufficient reason for believing (i) that Ignatius knew the Odes; (ii) that he was not

Digitized by Google

himself the Odist: as indeed his style bears no resemblance to the lofty strains of the Odes. Where the two writers come nearest together geographically is in the reference to the 'talking water', if that really means the water of Daphne. Is it possible that it is an Antiochene book of sacred songs that we have been discussing? They are certainly Antiphonal if they are not Ignatian: that part of the tradition of Socrates may be accepted.

Having traced certain agreements in thought and expression between Ignatius and the Odist we have been reminded that, quite in the early days of the criticism of the Odes, Professor de Zwaan constructed in the *American Journal of Theology* a spiritual parallel between the two writers.[1] He argued for 'a certain similarity', not so much between the Ignatian letters and the early Christian hymns which Dr. Harris had recovered, as between 'Ignatius and the Odist', and concluded that 'literary dependence is out of the question, but *spiritual kinship* is so clear in this case, notwithstanding the evident difference in character and pursuits, that one may feel sure of its testimony'.

Professor de Zwaan actually draws attention to the parallel between the language of Ignatius, *Ad Eph.* 19, '*Lack of knowledge* was destroyed' (so translating ἄγνοια), and the teaching of the Odist, who lays 'much more stress on truth and error than on the Cross'. But apparently he did not quote the actual words of the Odist (Ode vii) with regard to the 'destruction of ignorance'. He very justly makes a parallel between the 19th Ode and the language of Ignatius in reference to the Virgin Birth, and presumes that 'Ignatius would not have heard without edification the passage which to some scholars seems incongruous with the elevated tone of the Odes'. With this judgement we are in agreement, for Ignatius when he ventures into poetical figure can be almost as unbridled in the use of the imagination as anything we find in the Odes, and, moreover, he is undoubtedly in evidence for the Miraculous Conception and Birth.

[1] *Amer. Journ. Theol.* for 1911, pp. 617–25.

Digitized by Google

In discussing the tradition of Socrates with regard to the choral or antiphonal singing in the Church at Antioch, it is natural to refer to the passage in which Ignatius, in his letters, suggests choral singing to the Churches to whom he has written: it may be assumed that such forms of singing were familiar in Greek Churches, at all events. In the Epistle to the Ephesians Ignatius sets the chorus, which he forms, with its face towards the bishop, having previously strung the presbytery on the bishop, considered as the framework of a lyre. 'All of you form yourselves into a chorus', says he: 'in your harmonious love, Jesus Christ is sung.'

In the *Odes of Solomon*, upon whose choral character Tondelli and others have rightly laid such stress, we find the chorus for the most part involved in the doxology with which so many of the Odes conclude: but there is one Ode in which the Odist does not sing in his own person, but assumes an accompanying chorus and invites it. The language is so similar to that of Ignatius that we may resort to the interpretation by parallel. The 41st Ode, then, begins as follows:

> 'Let *all of us* who are the Lord's bairns, praise Him:
> And let us appropriate the truth of His faith:
> *And His children shall be acknowledged by Him:*
> Therefore *let us sing in His love.*
>
> . . . .
>
> Let us, therefore, *all of us unite together* in the name of the Lord.'

The Ignatian parallels, the one referred to above, and a corresponding one in the Epistle to the Romans, are as follows:

> '*In your* concord and harmonious *love* Jesus Christ *is sung.* And do ye, *each and all* (κατ' ἄνδρα), form yourselves into a chorus, that, being harmonious in concord, and taking the key-note of God, ye may *in oneness sing* with one voice through Jesus Christ unto the Father, that He may both hear you *and acknowledge you* by your good deeds to be the members of His Son (i. e. his children).'—*Ad Eph.* 4.
>
> 'Forming yourselves into a *chorus*, *in love sing* to the Father in Jesus Christ.'—*Ad Rom.* 2.

Digitized by Google

The language of Ignatius again suggests familiarity with the Odes, and confirms our belief in their choral character; it helps us to understand what is meant by the Syriac sentence which literally says, 'His children shall be known with Him', and which evidently means, 'Shall be acknowledged by Him' (ἐπιγνωσθήσονται) in accordance with Syriac idiom.

In the *editio princeps*, as stated above, there were feelers thrown out without any decisive result for coincidences with the Ignatian Epistles. One passage to which reference was made was in the 41st Ode, to which we have just been alluding, where the Odist tells us that

'The Christ is really One' (xli. 15),

and the parallel which was quoted was from the letter to the Magnesians, in the words,

εἷς ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.—*Ad Magn.* 7.

The parallel is really stronger than the quoted words. For it continues with the statement that there is 'one temple, even God; and one altar, even Jesus Christ, who came from One Father, and is with One and departed unto One'. This passage may be taken as a comment upon the sentence in the Ode, which it actually reproduces (without the adverb 'truly'); Lightfoot has wrongly emended ὅς for εἷς.

Let us see whether Ignatius agrees with the Odist in the treatment of the heretics of his time. He has already compared them to persons who put drugs in sweet drinks. We found, also, that the Odes describe such persons as 'mad dogs who ignorantly attack their Master', the language being derived, like so much else, from an allegorical interpretation of the 22nd Psalm. Ignatius also has described the heretics as 'mad dogs' (κύνες λυσσῶντες) who bite stealthily (λαθροδῆκται), and whose bite is practically incurable (*Ad Eph.* 7). These are evidently the same dogs as we know in the Odes. Apparently Ignatius has misunderstood the words of the Odist as to the dogs biting (ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ), which was

Digitized by Google

meant to express the ignorance of dogs failing to recognize their own particular master; Ignatius takes it to mean that the dogs bite when one is not aware of what is coming; the ignorance is in the bitten, not in the biter.

We see, then, that Ignatius regards the heretics and unbelievers as (i) poisoners; (ii) mad dogs, just as the Odist does. In the first instance the 'mad dog' was the Jew, and the mention of him came in from an anti-Judaic testimony against the Jews as a 'synagogue of evil-doers'; by Ignatius's time the application appears to be general.

A particular heresy which both writers combat is that which denied the unity of Christ's nature, perhaps a form of Docetism. Ignatius, as we have seen, may be using the very formula of the Odes ('Christ Jesus is one person').

We now come to a curious coincidence both in thought and in language between the Odes and the *Epistle of Barnabas*. In Ode xxxi. 10–13 the Odist is speaking in the person of Christ, and affirms:

> '*I endured and* held my peace,
>
> . . . .
>
> That I might redeem my people and *inherit it*:
> And that *I might not make void my promises to the patriarchs*,
> To whom I promised the salvation of their seed.'

With this we may compare *Barnabas*, c. 5:

> '*He himself endured* that He might destroy death and show forth the resurrection of the dead (for that He must needs be manifest in the flesh); *that* at the same time *He might redeem the promise made to the fathers* and prepare the new people for Himself,' &c.

The closest Biblical parallel is Romans xv. 8, where Christ is said to be God's minister:

εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων.

Digitized by Google

We may compare Irenaeus, iv. 15 (ed. Mass. 236):

> 'Abraham, et semen eius quod est Ecclesia, per Christum Iesum, cui et adoptio *redditur et haereditas quae Abrahae promissa est.*'

The same arguments may be found in Justin, *Dial.* 119, 120. It is possible that the coincidences are due to dependence upon a primitive collection of *Testimonies*. The coincidence, however, between the Odist's language and that of Barnabas is very close.

The suggestion in the foregoing passages that we have recovered a genuine parallel to the Odes in the *Epistle of Barnabas* encourages us to look more closely into the texture of this Epistle: for the *Epistle of Barnabas* is one of the least-valued books of the sub-apostolic literature and one of the most valuable. Its anti-Judaic character, combined with its constant dependence upon primitive anti-Judaic *Testimonia*, makes it one of the best exponents that we can find of primitive Christian belief and teaching. It quotes the *Teaching of the Apostles en bloc*, and not only *en bloc* but in separate passages.[1] The observation is an important one, as showing how Barnabas operates with his sources and is influenced by them. If, then, Barnabas uses written sources and uses them freely, as in the case of the *Didaché* and the *Testimony Book*, it is at least an open question whether he does not, in a similar manner, show reminiscence of the Odes. Let us see what the Epistle suggests in the way of parallels, over and above the reference to the 31st Ode which we have already quoted.

In i. 2 Barnabas speaks of having observed that upon his hearers there had been poured forth the Spirit *from the wealth of the fountain of the Lord*:

> *ἀληθῶς βλέπω ἐν ὑμῖν ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλουσίου τῆς πηγῆς Κυρίου πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.*

In Ode xi. 6 we have:

> 'Speaking waters touched my lips
> From the *fountain of the Lord plenteously.*'

[1] Cf. *Barn.* iv. 9.

The same expression 'the fountain of the Lord' occurs in Ode xxx. 2:

'Come all ye thirsty and take a draught,
And rest by *the fountain of the Lord.*'

In i. 4 Barnabas apologises for his loquacity in the Christian meetings, and says that

'Although I talked much among you I know well that *the Lord travelled with me in the way of righteousness.*'

ἐν ὑμῖν λαλήσας πολλὰ ἐπίσταμαι ὅτι ἐμοὶ συνώδευσεν ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης Κύριος.

In Ode xxxviii we have constant references to the companionship of the Truth with the Odist in his journey; e. g.:

'The Truth went with me':
'I walked with him':
'The Truth proceeds in the right path':
'I congratulated myself because the Truth went with me.'

Again in Ode xli. 11:

'His Word is with us in all our way.'

Again, in Ode xvii. 5:

'The thought of the Truth led me on,
And I walked after it and did not wander.'

In Barnabas iv. 12 we may note the expression used of the good man, that

'His righteousness shall go before him.'

(i. e. to judgement).

ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ προηγήσεται αὐτοῦ.

With this we may compare Ode viii. 21, 22:

'At my own right hand I set my elect:
And my righteousness goeth before them.'

Digitized by Google

Both of these passages go back ultimately into Isaiah lviii. 8:

> 'Thy righteousness shall go before thee.
> The glory of the Lord shall be thy rearward.'

> *καὶ προπορεύσεται ἔμπροσθέν σου ἡ δικαιοσύνη σου, καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ περιστελεῖ σε.*

Special attention should be paid to this section of Isaiah, because it is certainly a part of the primitive *Testimony Book*: the section in which it occurs is actually quoted in Barnabas iii, in order to establish the doctrine of the *new fast* ('Why do ye fast, saith the Lord?'); and it appears to have influenced one other passage in the Odes, viz. Ode xx. 9:

> '*His glory shall go before thee*,
> And thou shalt receive of His kindness and His grace.'

Either, then, Barnabas has been influenced by the Odes or by Isaiah; more probably the latter, as he is shown to have quoted the section of Isaiah to which we have been referring, and coincides in his language at one point with that section more closely than the Odist does.

In Barnabas xii. 5, where the brazen serpent is said to be a type of Jesus, we are told that:

> 'Moses again made a symbol of Jesus to show that He must suffer, and that He Himself *whom they shall think to have perished* shall make alive again by a sign (of his cross) though Israel falls (*or*, shall typically make alive again', &c.).

> *Πάλιν Μωϋσῆς ποιεῖ τύπον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν παθεῖν καὶ αὐτὸς ζωογονήσει ὃν δόξουσιν ἀπολωλεκέναι ἐν σημείῳ, πίπτοντος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.*

With this description of the Christ whom they shall think to have perished, we may compare:

Ode xxviii. 9:

> 'They supposed that I was swallowed up:
> *For I seemed to them as one of the lost.*'

Digitized by Google

Ode xxv. 5:

> 'I was despised and rejected in the eyes of many;
> And *I was in their eyes like lead*';

where the reading 'as lead' has been conjectured by us to be a misunderstanding of the word 'lost', 'perished'.

In Barnabas v. 7 we have already drawn attention to the statement that 'the Lord endured, in order that He might give back the promise to the fathers'; and we have compared Ode xxxi. 10–13, 'I *endured*... that I might redeem my people *and inherit it, and that I might not make void the promise to the patriarchs*'. We may now further compare Barnabas xiv. 4:

> 'The Lord Himself gave (the Covenant) to us, *for a people of His inheritance, having endured for our sakes.*'

εἰς λαὸν κληρονομίας, δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνας.

Here Barnabas appears again to have been influenced by the language of the Odes, and our first supposition is confirmed.

Reviewing the passages to which we have drawn attention, we think there is some reason for believing that Barnabas is under the influence of the Odes, though it would clearly be unwise to assume that the parallels which we have brought forward are all of equal validity, and one or two of them may have to be rejected. It is much to be wished that some competent scholar would give us a really good edition of this important sub-apostolic document.

As we have reason to believe that Ignatius of Antioch knew the Odes, and that the language of his letters is much under their influence, it is interesting to notice that a later bishop of the same city shows similar traces of dependence upon the Odist. Theophilus is a very learned person, and occupies an important position in the evolution of theology; it is interesting to see that when he treats of the errors of the Greek poets and philosophers, whom he knows well, he uses the same figure almost exactly as we detected in

Digitized by Google

Ignatius and the Odes. He says that, even if any truth was spoken by the Greeks, it was

> '*Truth mixed with error.* A strong *poison mixed with honey and wine* or any other liquid, renders the whole injurious and useless.'—Theoph. *Ad Autol.* ii. 12.
>
> *Καθάπερ γὰρ φάρμακόν τι δηλητήριον συγκραθὲν μέλιτι ἢ οἴνῳ, ἢ ἑτέρῳ τινί, τὸ πᾶν ποιεῖ βλαβερὸν καὶ ἄχρηστον.*

We can take the case of the supposed parallel to the Odes in Theophilus one stage further.

Theophilus speaks of the mingling of Truth and Error as comparable to the infusion of some deadly drug into honey or wine or something similar:

> *συγκραθὲν μέλιτι ἢ οἴνῳ ἢ ἑτέρῳ τινί.*—*Ad Autolycum*, ii. 3.

Here we notice that it is peculiar to use *ἑτέρῳ* for the third place in a series of specifications, where we should have expected *ἄλλῳ*. Our first impulse is to set it down as a case of want of precision, such as characterizes the common Greek of the Hellenistic period. Examination of the style of Theophilus does not show any such lack of precision, but on the contrary a careful observance of Greek usage. Here, for example, is a case where he introduces two alternatives followed by a third:

> *τοὺς παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις προφήτας ἢ Χαλδαίους τούς τε ἄλλους συγγραφεῖς.*—*Ad Autolycum*, ii. 32.[1]

It will be noticed that Theophilus uses *ἄλλους*, and not *ἑτέρους*, as of course he should do. We infer, then, that if he uses *ἑτέρῳ τινί* in the passage previously cited, he did not have two preceding terms, but only one. The natural inference is that *μέλιτι ἢ οἴνῳ* stands for a single word, which has been replaced, perhaps because it was not understood: accordingly we restore *οἰνομέλιτι* to the text of Theophilus, in harmony with Ignatius and the Odist. We need not be surprised at the change which has occurred (if our

[1] Cf. ii. 4 ἔνιοι . . . ἕτεροι . . . ἄλλοι.

argument be just) in the text of Theophilus, for the same kind of change was made by the translator, who turned the Ignatian Epistles into Syriac: he rendered *οἰνόμελι* by ܚܡܪܐ ܘܕܒܫܐ.

In another passage Theophilus corrects the Odes in an opinion, which we observed Bardaisan to hold, viz. that the sun and moon received light alternately from one another, the moon receiving light in the first half of the month, and giving it back during the period of waning. The Antioch astronomy was evidently ahead of the Edessan of the same date, the latter half of the second century. So Theophilus says:

> '*The sun always remains full*, without becoming less, as God always remains perfect .... but the moon as a type of man wanes month by month.'—Theoph. *Ad Autol.* i. 15.

Theophilus evidently did not believe with the Odist that the two Light Vessels poured, backward and forward, into one another. We suggest that he has corrected his Church Hymnal.

Cyril of Jerusalem has drawn upon the language of Ode xlii in which our Lord's descent into Hades is described. The Odist says:

> 'Those who had died *ran towards me*,
> And they cried and said, Son of God,' &c.—*Ode* xlii. 15.

Cyril expands the statement by specifying the persons to whom reference is made:

> 'The holy prophets *ran unto Him*, and Moses the Law-giver, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, David also, and Samuel and Elijah and John the Baptist.'—*Cat.* xiv. 19.

That is what one might call an enlarged edition of the Ode.

It is probable that Cyril may also furnish us with the key to the obscure sentence in the same Ode, where Hades lets go the head and the feet (of the Lord) (xlii. 13). It was suggested in the *editio princeps* that the Head was Christ and the Feet the Saints. We notice, however, that Cyril has another explanation of 'head

Digitized by Google

and feet' of Christ. He refers the words to the two natures in Christ, and illustrates from the eating of the Paschal Lamb:

> 'We who are accounted worthy to partake of the spiritual Lamb, partake of the head with the feet: of the head, which means His Godhead; of the feet, that is His manhood.'
>
> *Catech.* xii. 1.

Is there any early explanation of Exod. xii. 9 that runs on that line of thought?

Cyril of Jerusalem also treats the 22nd Psalm as containing a prophecy of the Miraculous Birth, though he does not, like Eusebius, speak of God the Father in midwife language, and so make connexion with the Odes. According to Cyril:

> '*Thou art He*, says the Psalmist, *that drew me out of the womb*. Mark carefully the word, *drew me out of the womb*, which means that He was born without man, being drawn from the womb and the flesh of the Virgin: for it is different in the case of them that are born of the marriage law.'
>
> Cyril, *Catech.* xii. 25.

It seems, from the artificial meaning which Cyril attaches to the word 'drew out', that he is avoiding the interpretation put on the word by Eusebius and the Odist. There is no doubt that he regards the Psalm as predicting the Virgin Birth.

A coincidence between the Odes and Irenaeus was pointed out in the *editio princeps*, without presenting an absolute claim for the recognition of a quotation. Now that we have the antiquity of the Odes well established there seems no reason for hesitation as to Irenaeus's acquaintance with them. The passage referred to was as follows: Irenaeus is explaining that the less God needs man, the more man needs God *and His fellowship*:

> 'In quantum enim Deus nullius indiget, in tantum homo indiget Dei communionis.'
>
> Iren. *adv. Haer.* iv. 25 (Mass. 243).

Digitized by Google

Here we have the thought of fellowship with God as the expression of man's need, just as in Ode iv:

> 'Thou hast given us *thy fellowship*:
> *It was not that thou wast in need of us*:
> but that *we were in need of thee.*'—*Ode* iv. 9.

The same thought recurs a little lower in the form:

> 'Ipse quidem *nullius indigens*: his vero *qui indigent eius, suam praebens communionem.*'

And again, in the following book, Irenaeus returns to the theme:

> 'Nihil enim illi ante dedimus, neque desiderat aliquid a nobis, *quasi indigens*: nos autem *indigemus* eius quae est ad eum communionis (χρῃζόμεθα τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν κοινωνίας).'
> Iren. *adv. Haer.* v. 2, p. 293.

It was remarked that, in these passages, 'the evidence is rather in the direction of recognizing a quotation on the part of Irenaeus from the Odes'. The hesitation was proper to the first exposition, but may now be discarded, and Irenaeus numbered amongst those who are familiar with the Odes.[1]

Before leaving this part of the subject, we may point out some remarkable coincidences with the *Apology of Aristides*, c. i. In Ode vi. 5 we have the statement that

> 'Nothing should be His adversary,
> Nothing should stand up against Him.'

In the *Apology of Aristides* we have the following statement:

> '*Adversary He has none*:
> For there is none that is more powerful than He:
> Anger and wrath He possesses not;
> *For there is nothing that is able to stand against Him.*'

[1] It is not a little curious that Ephrem twice attacks as heretical the opinion that God was in no need of man: for instance,

> 'The heretics endeavour to say of Him that He is in no need at all, but that He furnished us with opportunity to be saved by all means.'
> *R.E.* ii. 522: cf. also *R.E.* iii. 12.

Was he, perhaps, attacking the Bardesanians for their use of the Odes?

Digitized by Google

That is how the passage runs, rhythmically enough in the Syriac translation. The Greek is a mere staccato abbreviation at this point: God is

> ἀνώτερος πάντων τῶν παθῶν
> . . . . . .
> ὀργῆς τε καὶ λήθης καὶ
> ἀγνοίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν.

Now the concurrence noted above may be accidental, and the statements may be the trite phrases of Theistic teaching; but their coincidence deserves study. For this is not the only coincidence which the Odes show with the opening chapter of Aristides's *Apology*. Here we have also the statement (a conventional one, it must again be admitted) that

> 'He stands in need of nought,
> But everything stands in need of Him.'[1]

which is in Ode iv. 9 in the form:

> 'It was not that thou wast in need of us;
> But that we are in need of thee.'

The passage about the impossibility of an adversary to God is followed in the Syriac Aristides by the words:

> 'Error and forgetfulness are not in His nature;
> For He is altogether wisdom and understanding.'

(The Greek abbreviation quoted above suggests that 'ignorance' should be added after 'forgetfulness'.)

But this is very like Ode xviii. 8–11:

> 'Thou art my God:
> . . . . .
> Error thou knowest not,
> For neither knows it thee.
> And ignorance . . . .'

[1] The very same statement in Tatian, *Oratio*, chap. 4: 'He who is in want of nothing is not to be misrepresented by us as though he were in need.'

Digitized by Google

If the parallelism had been in a different region from that of philosophical and theological commonplaces we should have said at once that one of these writers was quoting the other. As it is the parallelisms of the sentences and the close coincidences in language seem to involve some connexion between Aristides and the Odes.

We come now to a remarkable statement, due apparently to Anastasius the Presbyter in the fifth century, which seems to refer the authorship of the Odes to Montanus in the second century or to some earlier date.

In the seventh volume of Mai's *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio* there occur a number of unedited fragments from a Patristic Catena on the Incarnation. These are accompanied by a series of extracts from detestable heretics, who give their testimonies on the same theme, such as Ebion (!) Paul of Samosata, Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, &c. Amongst these we find as follows (p. 69): *Μοντανοῦ ἐκ τῶν ᾠδῶν· Μίαν ὁ Χριστὸς ἔχει τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ πρὸ τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ μετὰ τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα μὴ διάφορος γένηται ἀνόμοια καὶ διάφορα πράττων.*

We have here a statement that Montanus composed Odes (such at least is the natural inference on first reading the passage), and that the doctrine of the unity of the nature of Christ was taught in them; according to the quotation from these Odes, this unity existed both before and after the Incarnation. The Ode quoted would thus be capable of an anti-docetic interpretation, and would not allow that the Christ had descended upon Jesus. The emphasis in the quotation is on the word *μίαν* with which it opens.

Now when we turn to our *Odes of Solomon*, we find as follows: 'The Christ is truly one; and he was known [i. e. as such] before the foundations of the world, that he might save souls for ever by the truth of his name.'—*Ode Sol.* xli. 15, 16. Here we have something very like the quotation brought forward by Mai and attributed to Montanus. The anti-docetic statement as to the unity of the Messiah, i. e. of Christ in the flesh, is accompanied by a statement

Digitized by Google

as to his pre-existence, not only before the Incarnation but before the foundation of the world.

Is it possible that there is any connexion between the quotation of Mai and the passage in the Odes? Assuming that the extract is rightly referred to Montanus, can he be regarded as the author of the Odes? It will be remembered that the Odes had already been claimed as Montanus's by Mr. F. C. Conybeare, and it may be admitted that the tradition as to Montanus's teaching finds excellent illustration in the Odes. On the other hand, it is impossible to regard the extract which Mai gives from his Vatican manuscript as poetical in form. It is clearly, undeniably prose. Consequently it can only be connected with the Odes as commentary is connected with text. The Odes must underlie the passage referred to Montanus, if the connexion be conceded. Upon this supposition the Odes must be as early as 175 A.D., if Montanus is glossing his own composition, or much earlier, if he is quoting a recognized Church book of sacred songs. The latter appears to be the correct conclusion, but we may allow for a margin of doubt, and for the possibility of some other explanation.

Dr. Bernard has made a great deal more than was warranted of a reference in the Syriac *Testamentum Domini*,[1] where a rubric for the morning office directs that there should be sung 'four hymns of praise, one by Moses, and of Solomon and of the other prophets'.

The rubric certainly does not mean 'one hymn out of a collection ascribed to Solomon'. It is, probably, nothing more than an injunction to sing the 72nd Psalm, whose heading is 'A Psalm of Solomon'.[2]

The parallel with Moses is explained in like manner by a reference to the 90th Psalm; it is doubtful if there is any reference at all to the so-called canticles which appear at the end of the Psalter in some copies of the LXX.

[1] I. 26.

[2] The Targum says it was spoken prophetically by Solomon.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIGIN AND TIME OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE ODES.

WE now pass on to discuss the 'when and the where' of the Odes, on the assumption that they constitute a literary unity, and that the problem is not to be complicated, in the first instance at all events, by a multitude of suggested interpolations. That is, we set on one side for the present, and perhaps finally, such theories as that of Harnack, who finds the Odes to be a Jewish document, patched with Christian interpolations; we also set on one side, *pro tempore*, and again perhaps finally, the theory of the first edition that Odes xix and xlii betrayed a later hand and a more highly evolved doctrine than the rest of the book. We put in a plea, on behalf of the author, against his first editors and commentators, that a little more time should be spent on understanding his text before the hypothesis of interpolation is resorted to. For example, even if we conceded something in favour of a belief in strata of late theological thought in certain Odes, we must at once check ourselves from drawing hasty critical consequences, by the observation that it is these very Odes that may turn out to have the earliest literary attestation. The 19th Ode, for example, grotesque as it may seem to us in its allegory, and full-fledged in its details of the Virgin Birth, is precisely the Ode which Lactantius quotes; and we have shown that he took it from an early collection of *Testimonies*, an observation which at once carries us back to a time when the Odes were a part of the Old Testament, and to the second century, if not to the first.

The accuracy of the observation is confirmed by our discovery that the very same Ode is quoted by Eusebius and by Theodoret. It must be allowed that the 19th Ode has acquired chronological dignity.

Digitized by Google

Not very different is the case of the 42nd Ode, which has such a strongly developed *Descensus ad Inferos* involved in it. Here again we have a quotation recognized, this time by Cyril of Jerusalem, which takes us back to the year A.D. 348. Citations such as these should make us hesitate before we resort to the theory of interpolation, and the argument from the Unity of Style looks in the same direction. It seems, therefore, best to set Harnack and those who follow his method of criticism on one side, and try to solve the problem on the hypothesis that the Odes are a literary unity, with a definite time and place of production.

We reopen the investigation with a sense of a large increase in the data for the solution of the problem, since the first expositions of the subject were made. Some of the fresh data supply arguments for the time of composition of the Odes, others give suggestions both for time and place. For example, when we explain the meaning of Lactantius's quotation from the 19th Ode, and trace it to an early collection of *Testimonies against the Jews*, we lose the note of place, supplied by Nicomedia, and we may add, the note of language: we have no longer any evidence for Latin Odes, but we have evidence for the existence of the Odes, either in Greek or some Semitic language, at a much earlier date than Lactantius. In the same way, when we are dealing with the occurrence of the Odes in the *Pistis Sophia*, we keep apparently the note of place, but the note of time is made for a much earlier period than the end of the third century, when the *Pistis Sophia* was produced; for if the Sahidic Odes were taken from the Sahidic Psalter and were bound up with the Psalter, we are again carried backwards in time: we have first to allow for the fact that the Sahidic Bible is necessarily earlier than the *Pistis Sophia* (an important point for Biblical critics), but also we have to remember that the Sahidic Old Testament is disclosed to us as a translation from the Septuagint, with which, for the purposes of our inquiry, the Odes must be connected. The Egyptian note of place does

Digitized by Google

not altogether disappear, but it becomes secondary and relatively unimportant.

When we come to actual Patristic quotations, or to references which are the equivalent of citations, we find as the result of careful investigation two lines of tradition opening out before us, one which may be called Mesopotamian, and the other which may be called Palestinian, or at all events, West Syrian.

The first line is marked by definite fixed points. It may be taken as proved that the Odes in their present Syriac form were well known to Ephrem. Definite quotations have been established, and general allusions abound. Later Syriac writers can be put in evidence: Moses bar Kepha, for instance, interprets the Odes baptismally, and it is possible that the Eastern rituals may show traces of their influence. For us the fixed point of departure is Ephrem, since he is a genuine Syrian knowing no Greek, and the evidence is decisive for the actual use of our Syriac text, which is thus carried back into the fourth century in Mesopotamia.

The next point for the same region and for Edessa as a centre is the somewhat less certain observation that Ephrem attacks Bardaisan for an interpretation which he makes of the Odes in the region of astronomy, where the Sun and Moon are regarded as supplying light, each to the other, the Moon receiving light during the period of its waxing and returning it in the time of its waning.

Here Bardaisan, if we have understood the matter rightly, speaks in the very language of the Odes, and makes the interpretation of the Ode quoted, an interpretation which was not unnaturally missed by the first editors. It is probable, as we have said, that we must translate the passage in the 16th Ode to which we refer in the sense that

> 'Their reception (*sc.* of the Sun and Moon) one from the other speaks (*or* fulfils) the beauty of God.'—*Ode* xvi. 17.

Thus we may, perhaps, get another fixed point in the use of the Odes by Bardaisan. The suggestion arises that Bardaisan

Digitized by Google

may, then, himself be the author of the Odes, an idea already thrown out by Newbold, upon other grounds, but without sufficient reason.[1] We do not think Newbold's investigations are to be undervalued. He was quite right in maintaining that 'no antecedent improbability precludes the ascription of the Odes to Bardaisan'; we have given above a proof that he is also right in saying that some of the Odes can be readily interpreted in the light of Bardaisan's theories (the 16th Ode, for instance). But since Newbold wrote his interesting article we have fresh information concerning Bardaisan, in the recently published *Discourses of Ephrem to Hypatius*, and these new Discourses require to be carefully studied; we have also, as we shall see, evidence which will take the Odes to an earlier period than that of Bardaisan.

It would have been a pleasure to endorse Newbold's suggestion of the Bardesanian authorship of the Odes, which came up also in our own field of view. Bardaisan was, no doubt, both scholar and saint, a Syrian blend of Socrates and St. John; and if we could prove him to be the author he would be a worthy author, for he was certainly a great Christian, and perhaps the greatest man that Syria ever produced. If we cannot redeem his character from the aspersions of many generations, we can salute him with a lowly reverence in passing, and make him a fixed point in the inquiry upon which we are engaged.

Bardaisan's period of literary activity is the latter half of the second century: if we set his birth in A.D. 154 and his death in A.D. 222, we conclude that the Odes (in the Syriac form in which we know them) were perhaps extant in Edessa in the latter part of the second century. There, for the present, our first line of advance stops: we cannot get any earlier Syriac patristic evidence: it stops with Bardaisan. That is a very important position gained.

Our next line of investigation runs through western Syria.

[1] 'Bardaisan and the Odes of Solomon', in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxx, Part II, 1911.

Digitized by Google

We can begin, if we please, at Jerusalem. St. Cyril's *Lectures* are valuable in many ways beside the light they throw upon the preparation of catechumens in the middle of the fourth century, and on the Jerusalem rituals of that date. These lectures are based upon the prophets as the only authority, and the proof-texts are in the main those which occur in collections of *Testimonies against the Jews.* He constantly indulges in side-thrusts at the Jews, which was not unnatural considering the position which he occupied. We should naturally expect that a writer or an orator, who practises so skilfully the art of quotation, will make familiar use of a book like the Odes, which may very likely have been still in use in Jerusalem, and was itself, as we believe, deeply tinged with anti-Judaism and closely linked with the early Church method of teaching by Testimonies.

Dr. Bernard has suggested that in the prefatory lecture to the catechumens Cyril has actually used the first Ode, and the parallel is certainly a very striking one. We have shown that Cyril also quotes from the 42nd Ode, thus establishing his acquaintance with the book from first to last in the form in which we possess it. There is more light to be thrown on the Odes by Cyril, and perhaps more actual quotations may be found; but even where we cannot always find the evidence of direct citation we can see Cyril dealing with similar problems to the Odist, and sometimes correcting the explanations of the latter. For example, while Cyril approves of the reference to Christ in Psalm xxii. 10 ('thou art he that didst draw me out of my mother's womb'), he will not introduce God the Father as operating after the manner of a midwife, but explains that it refers to the drawing of flesh from the substance of the Virgin. When again he is interpreting the term *Monogenēs* as applied to Christ, he almost always interprets it to mean that Christ had no brother: this is what the Odist makes Christ Himself say ('I was not their brother, nor my birth like theirs', Ode xxviii. 16); so that both writers are dealing with the same problem, but we must not say that Cyril is quoting the Ode: he is

Digitized by Google

probably making a popular theological statement such as was also familiar to the Odist.

Now let us move to Caesarea and to a slightly earlier date. We have shown the importance of Eusebius in the explanation of the Odes by pointing out a number of positive quotations of the first importance. As in the case of Cyril, these references are sometimes Old Testament references as well as references to the Odes. Eusebius agrees with Cyril in the use of conventional *Testimonia adversus Iudaeos*. He uses the 22nd Psalm when at the same time he is quoting the Odes. The one is the bridge to the other. These Eusebian extracts are not only valuable in themselves: they serve to bring the Odes with themselves into a theological system, into a propaganda of an anti-Judaic character. In this point of view it is peculiarly important to find so much stress laid upon the 22nd Psalm. The use made of this Psalm by the Odist, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and others, shows that it was an armoury of weapons for controversy with the Jews, some of which were found ready to hand, as in the quotation of the opening words of the Psalm by the Crucified, and some of which appear to have been manufactured artificially, like the interpretation of the 'extraction of the Messiah from the womb of the Virgin'.

It will be agreed that Eusebius must have been familiar with the Odes and have shared some points of view with the Odist. He, for instance, does not try to get rid of the description of God the Father as *μαιούμενος*, in the way that Cyril appears to do. Much of what we learnt from Eusebius was arrived at by the study of that much neglected book the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, a work which is based from first to last on excerpts of the Septuagint, with occasional side-lights from the Hebrew or the Hexaplaric versions. The *Demonstratio* is, in fact, a *Testimony Book* with a Commentary, just in the same way as Cyril's work is *Lectures on Testimonies*: only, where Cyril calls them *Testimonies*, Eusebius habitually reverts to an even earlier title and calls them *Logia*.

Digitized by Google

The importance of these observations lies in the fact that Eusebius was working on Greek texts when writing his *Demonstratio*, and we may infer that he knew the Odes also in Greek. Not that he was incapable of Syriac scholarship, as we know from his actual use of Edessan records in his *History*; but there does not seem to be any reason to invoke Syriac at this point. If, however, any one should object to the statement, made absolutely, that Eusebius used the Odes in Greek, the question can remain open. The Greek text was certainly current when Eusebius wrote. The question of the relative priority of Greek and Syriac is not a fourth-century problem: it belongs a good deal higher up. In connexion with Eusebius's use of the Odes in the interpretation of the 22nd Psalm, we pointed out a similar use in the case of Theodoret. He, too, interprets the mad dogs that do not know their master. He, too, is a Syriac scholar in a bilingual Church and community. We think it is possible that he may be dependent upon Eusebius; if not, he is working on the same tradition, and may be reckoned as acquainted with the Odes.

Theodoret's position is a peculiar one, as he forms a link between Antioch and Edessa. It will be remembered that he was a leading agent in the extrusion of the Diatessaron from the churches in the diocese of Cyrrhus. This probably means the Syriac-speaking churches; but he himself is an Antiochene, born in Antioch in the closing years of the fourth century, and brought up in a monastery not far from Antioch. It is, therefore, natural for us to turn in the next instance to Antioch itself, where we have been fortunate enough to detect the use of the Odes by no less a person than Ignatius the Martyr. If the parallels which we brought forward are valid, then it is hardly possible to refer the Odes to any other time than the first century, or to any other district than Antioch. The question of the original language of the Odes may be left open for a little longer: Ignatius himself, though we know him by Greek writings and Greek traditions, is in many ways more like a Syrian than a Greek; and even if he

Digitized by Google

should be a true Greek the church over which he ruled was Syrian as well as Greek.

In support of an Antiochene origin for the Odes we have urged above that another bishop of Antioch, somewhat later than Ignatius, shows traces of an acquaintance with the Odes. This time it is not a choice between Syriac and Greek, for Theophilus, who writes the treatise *to Autolycus*, in the year A.D. 168, is educated as a Greek (though perhaps of Mesopotamian origin), familiar with the Greek poets and philosophers, and altogether diverse in character from Ignatius. Yet we find him making what seems to be the same comparison that Ignatius does, of the heretics who mingle error with truth, to those who put poisonous drugs in honey-wine; and we also find him using language concerning the Sun and Moon which seems to deliberately contradict the Odist, who believes the two great lights to be vessels, which are filled alternately one from the other. Here again the antiquity of the Odes appears to be established, as well as the area in which they are most at home.

Only one further sub-Apostolic writer has been claimed by us as a possible witness to the Odes. In the so-called Epistle of Barnabas we have a writing commonly referred to the last decade of the first century, or the first decade of the second century, and generally supposed to bear marks of an Egyptian ancestry. The evidence which we bring forward from Barnabas will be thought less convincing than what we have adduced from other writers. It is not altogether negligible, even if it is not so striking as that furnished by Ephrem, Eusebius or Ignatius. It may for the present be covered by *valeat quantum.*

Our second line of advance has now brought us very nearly into conjunction with the first: for not only is Edessa religiously and politically adjacent to Antioch, but Bardaisan spans the space between them, as being at once a Greek scholar and a philosopher and a man of travel, familiar with cities and with men. There is no difficulty in joining up the communities to which we assign the

Digitized by Google

earliest traces of the Odes; and if we are wrong in assigning them as written at Antioch in the first century, we are not far wrong either in place or in time.

CHAPTER V

Christ and Solomon.

A few words may be thought necessary on the question whether the name of Solomon attached to the Odes is more than the *nom de plume* of the author, or an artificial title assimilating the new Christian Psalter to the ancient Psalter of David, or to the already existing Pharisee Psalms which go under the name of the Psalter of Solomon. Clearly there is no necessity to involve Solomon in the structure of the Odes because his name is on the cover. On the other hand, it is possible that there may be a Salomonic influence in their composition. For instance, the fact of the Odes being bound up with the Old Testament in certain Greek bibles, as we have shown to be probable, would mean that they had been grouped with other writings more or less definitely accredited to Solomon. If, then, we should find that there were traces of a strong influence on the Odes from the Sapiential books, we might be led to suspect that they had been composed with the view of continuing the Salomonic tradition, in which case it is no longer a matter of a mere bookmaker's or bookseller's title. And it is certain that our Odes are frequently coloured from Sapiential books; the margins and notes of this edition will show abundant evidence on this head. May we go further than this, and is it possible that the history as well as the supposed writings of Solomon have been drawn upon for incident or allusion? Let us take a case which is parallel to our inquiry. The *Wisdom of Solomon* affects to be the work of the Wise Man of Israel, and it imitates very effectively the noblest passages in the book of

Digitized by Google

Proverbs, frequently borrowing whole sentences by way of justifying its title. But it does more than this: to keep up the illusion of the title, it brings Solomon himself on the scene and makes him tell the story of his own birth and education. Three whole chapters (vii–ix) tell how the royal babe grew up, became enamoured of Wisdom (whom the Most High also loved), and prayed that she might be his bride; the prayer is given in detail in the ninth chapter, and is a very noble aspiration. It is therefore open to us to raise the question whether Solomon may not be involved also in the Odes, either by historical allusion or by quotation from his supposed language and experience. With this hangs another supposition; we know that Christ in certain circles in the Church occupied a quasi-Salomonic position; on the one hand He was identified with the Wisdom of the Sapiential books, on the other He was identified with Solomon, as being 'great David's greater Son'; and one of the Psalms in which the future glories of Solomon are described was, in the earliest days of the Christian faith, pressed into the service of theology.[1]

It seems that we ought at least to contemplate the possibility of some such influence in the Odes as we have described, say, in the *Wisdom of Solomon*. For example, in the prayer just alluded to we have the request:

'Reject me not from among thy servants (παιδῶν);
For I am thy servant (δοῦλος) and the son of thy handmaid.'

It is curious that in the Odes we get a similar refrain: the 29th Ode ends as follows:

'I gave praise to the Most High,
Because He exalted His servant
And the son of His handmaid.'

Apparently Christ is here referred to. The language may be conventional; or again, it may be Salomonic.

[1] See Ps. lxxi (lxxii), 'Give the King thy judgements', &c., and the comments of the earliest Fathers upon it.

Digitized by Google

The importance of the inquiry lies in the possibility that it offers of elucidation of obscure references in the Odes. It is not surprising that the crown with which the Odist is adorned in the first Ode has been regarded by some persons as the nuptial crown of King Solomon in the Canticles: 'the crown with which his mother crowned him in the day of his espousals', and certainly the first Ode is of the nature of a spiritual epithalamium.

Equally suggestive is the possibility that the references to the Temple on the part of the Odist may find their explanation in the story of the building of Solomon's temple. In the fourth Ode it has been conjectured that the words

'Thou hast given *thy heart*, O Lord, to thy believers' (Ode iv. 3),

might be illustrated by the promise of the Lord to Solomon that

'My eyes and *my heart* shall be there continually'
(2 Chron. vii. 17),

so that the Odist may have had Solomon's Temple in his mind when he began the Ode with the affirmation that

'No man, O my God, changeth thy holy place.'

For we find in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, in the prayer which we quoted above, the same assertion of the eternity and immovability of the Divine dwelling-place:

'Thou didst bid me build a temple in thy holy mountain:
And an altar in the place of thy tabernacling,
An imitation of the holy Tabernacle
Which thou didst prepare from the beginning.'
Sap. Sol. ix. 8.

These words may furnish us with the very key that we need to the understanding of the perplexing fourth Ode.

The writer sees two temples, one the Salomonic building, which can be changed and moved; the other and elder, the spiritual sanctuary of which the Jewish temple is, at best, the transient mimicry. Other suggestions may be made in the same directions.

Digitized by Google

They must of necessity be tentative in our present state of knowledge and of criticism. It seems, however, to be proper to allude to the possibility of further Salomonic elucidations, even if they have, at first, to be covered by a cautious *valeat quantum*.

The case for a Salomonic element in the Odes will be much strengthened, if our interpretation of the 37th Ode should acquire probability. In this Ode we have suggested that the Odist personates Solomon himself in his prayer at the Dedication festival, and in his subsequent reception of a gracious message from God. Even if we suppose the language to describe the Odist's own experience of answered prayer, it is couched in the language of Solomon, so that the Odist had the King of Israel in his mind when he wrote: that is, the reference of the Odes to Solomon belongs to the original collection, and not to the hand of any later bookseller or editor.

We may also refer to the suggestion made by several who have written on the Odes, that it is Solomon, under his other name of Jedidiah, or *Beloved of the Lord*, who is responsible for the appearance of the 'Beloved' in the third Ode. Abbott draws attention to the language employed in 2 Samuel xii. 24:

> 'There is in the second book of Samuel a record connecting "love" with the anticipations formed by some about the infant king: and he (i. e. David) called his name Solomon. And *the Lord loved him*, and sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and he called his name *Jedidiah*.'

CHAPTER VI

The Christology of the Odes.

Since the Odes were first published a good deal of light has fallen, from one quarter or another, on the dogmatic position of the writer, and especially upon his Christology. It has, for instance, become increasingly clear that Christ is often made to be the chief

Digitized by Google

speaker in the Odes, so that the structure of an Ode can be resolved into (i) a prologue on the part of the Odist; (ii) an oracular statement made *ex ore Christi*; and (iii) a doxology, which is meant for the congregation to participate in, when the Ode is recited or sung. We have tried to indicate the transitions between the parts of such Odes by the insertion of the words *Christus loquitur* or *Doxologia*; and it will probably be found that the understanding of the Ode is much assisted by the division thus made, though it may be admitted that there will be a margin of uncertainty as to the points where the dividing chasms have to be placed. By making Christ speak for Himself the Odist secures a position of literary advantage for the enunciation of dogmatic truth. It is almost equivalent to the 'thus saith the Lord' of the ancient prophet, or the words of Paul when he affirms that 'this we say unto you by the word of the Lord'. Indeed, the Odist sometimes casts his thought of personal inspiration into this very mould, as, for instance, when he asks (Ode xxvi), 'Who can so rest (*or*, Oh! that one could so rest) on the Most High, that with (God's) mouth he may speak?', language which recalls Jeremiah xv. 19, 'Thou shalt be as my mouth'. The singer is, in fact, a prophet as well as a poet, and uses prophetic formulae and prophetic emphasis.

We might take as an illustration of the illumination which is thus cast upon the Odes a specimen Ode like the 28th, of which the *editio princeps* was not able to say more than that 'in some respects the Psalm appears to be Messianic in a Christian sense, for the writer concludes his exulting strain over enemies who had come round him like mad dogs, and had left him for dead, with the remark that it was not possible for them to blot out the memory of one who existed before them, and who was of a different birth from theirs'; and it was added that 'Perhaps the writer is speaking in these verses, as if in the Person of Christ'.

The hesitation was quite proper to a first inquiry, but it may be finally laid aside. The passage about 'mad dogs that ignorantly attack their master' has been definitely recognized in Eusebius and

Digitized by Google

in Theodoret as an expansion and interpretation of the 22nd Psalm, and further investigation shows other traces of the same Psalm, interpreted Messianically.

The statement that 'I was not their brother, nor my birth like theirs', has been shown to cover the doctrine that the Son of God is Monogenēs or Only-begotten, without a brother, and that His birth was miraculous. The evidence of Cyril of Jerusalem, to which we have referred above, will be found to be decisive on the first of the points involved. Thus Christ is certainly the speaker, and says definitely in the Ode:

> 'I am the Only-Begotten Son,
> I am miraculously born,'

just as He is the speaker in the 22nd Psalm, according to the view of primitive Christians.

Yet it is not easy to mark the exact point where the Ode modulates, so that the Odist's 'I' becomes the 'I' of the Messiah. Probably the change of key is at the words:

> 'They who saw me marvelled at me.'

We should then have an exactly parallel situation to that in the 41st Ode where the Odist stops his own recitative with the words:

> 'Let us exult with the joy of the Lord,'

and the Lord begins with:

> 'All they that see me will be astonished at me,'

and continues certainly as far as the stanza:

> 'The (Father of Truth) possessed me from the beginning:
> His wealth begat me, and the thought of His heart.'

Even where we have to allow a margin of residual uncertainty for the translation from speaker to speaker, it is a great advantage to have dogmatic statements made as if by Christ Himself at first hand.

Digitized by Google

The last instance to which we referred leads to another very important discovery, which has gradually drawn the attention of the students of the Odes. In the words just referred to Christ is speaking not only in His own person, but in the person of Wisdom, for the language is borrowed from the eighth chapter of Proverbs:

> 'The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way.'
> Prov. viii. 22.

Thus Christ is made to say that 'He is the Wisdom of God', and this is only one of a series of passages in which the Christology of the Odist is based upon the Sapiential books. It is hardly necessary to remind the dogmatic theologian of the importance which the eighth chapter of Proverbs plays in the history and evolution of the Nicene Symbol, but it is necessary, both for the understanding of the Odes and of the primitive Christology, to point out that other Sapiential books are treated in the same way as we have seen the Odist treat Proverbs, and that the seventh chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon in particular is a rich and fertile soil for the growth of Christian formulae. Here, for example, we find Wisdom defined as Monogenēs, as an *ἀπαύγασμα* or Effulgence of God, as an *ἀπόρροια* or Efflux of His glory, as an *ἀτμίς* or Emanation of His power, and as an *ἔσοπτρον* or Mirror of His activity. Monogenēs needs no explanation; it is fundamental to the Christian Symbol; the Effulgence also is well-known, since it passed from the Wisdom of Solomon to the Wisdom of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We shall show in another place the importance of the doctrine of Efflux, both for the understanding of the Odes and of the *Pistis Sophia*, as well as for its Nicene relations. It is curious that the Odist treats it as the Efflux of an irresistible stream of Water, while the *Pistis Sophia* makes it an outburst of Light. Origen in his commentary on Romans leans to the interpretation of the *Pistis Sophia*, and so does Athenagoras.

The Lord as the Mirror is the key to the very beautiful 13th Ode in our collection.

Digitized by Google

The knowledge that Wisdom-texts are being employed by the Odist makes it interesting to inquire whether there are any traces of the definition of Wisdom (or the Sophia-Christ) under the connotation of ἀτμίς.

It will help us to understand the part which these terms ἀτμίς, ἀπόρροια, and ἀπαύγασμα have played in the definition of Christ as the Wisdom of God, if we transcribe some passages from the Commentary of Origen on the Epistle to the Hebrews:

> 'Cum autem discutitur hoc quod dictum est de Filio Dei, quod est splendor gloriae (*sc.* ἀπαύγασμα), necessario videtur simul disserendum et illud quod dictum est, non solum quod splendor est lucis aeternae, sed et quod huic simile in Sapientia Salomonis refertur, in qua seipsam Sapientia describit dicens: *Vapor enim est virtutis Dei, et aporrhaea gloriae Omnipotentis purissima* (Sap. vii. 25).
>
> . . . .
>
> Oportet autem scire nos quia per ineffabilia quaedam, et secreta ac recondita quemdam modum sibi faciens, Scriptura Sancta conatur hominibus indicare, et intellectum suggerere subtilem; *vaporis* enim nomen inducens hoc ideo de rebus corporalibus assumpsit, et vel ex parte aliqua intelligere possimus, quomodo *Christus, qui est Sapientia*, secundum similitudinem eius *vaporis qui de substantia* aliqua corporali procedit, sic etiam ipse ut quidam *vapor* exoritur *de virtute* ipsius Dei: sic et *Sapientia* ex eo procedens, *ex ipsa Dei Substantia generatur*. Sic nihilominus et secundum similitudinem corporalis aporrhaeae, et dicitur "aporrhaea gloriae Omnipotentis pura quaedam et sincera". Quae utraque similitudinis manifestissime ostendunt *communionem substantiae esse Filio cum Patre*. Aporrhaea enim ὁμοούσιος videtur, id est, unius substantiae cum illo corpore ex quo est vel aporrhaea, vel vapor.'

These comments show how Christ was identified with Wisdom on the one hand, and with the descriptions of Wisdom on the other, and how the Nicene formula was anticipated. In the argument of Origen ἀπόρροια and ἀτμίς are a pair of corporeal illustrations

Digitized by Google

of the Homoousian doctrine. We have found the *ἀπόρροια* in the Odes, let us now look for the *ἀτμίς*.

Gressmann thinks that instead of ܬܘܢܝܐ in Ode xii. 5 (expression), we should at the second time read ܬܢܢܐ (= *ἀτμίς*), so as to render:

> 'The swiftness of the Word is inexpressible,
> Like an *ἀτμίς* is its swiftness and its sharpness.'

Some such restoration seems necessary, and if it can be justified, then the *ἀτμίς* as well as the *ἀπόρροια* is a part of the intellectual furniture of the Odist. See further our note on the verse in question.

As soon as we have detected in the Odes at any point the use of the Sapiential terms to which we have been referring, we see that the pre-existence of Christ is affirmed in the generation of the Divine Wisdom, to which Origen would add that the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son is also involved: but the Odist will hardly have seen as far into possible controversy as this. He is nearer to the Pauline position that 'Christ is the Power of God and the Wisdom of God', without undue elaboration of what is involved in that doctrine.

Where the Odist does seem to be face to face with controversial matter is in the 41st Ode, where Christ is described as the Word that was beforetime in the Father, after which the Odist adds:

> 'The Christ is *truly One*:
> And He was known before the foundation of the world.'

The words 'The Christ is truly one', taken along with the other statements as to His pre-existence, suggest a controversy over a division in the Nature of Christ, such a controversy as finds reflection in the first Epistle of John (1 John iv. 3) where we are told that

πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν,

and where some Docetic fission of the Nature of the Son appears to be contemplated. It would be, however, premature to affirm

Digitized by Google

that the Christology of the Odist can at all points be compressed within the limits of orthodox definition, for at the early date to which we have referred the composition of the Odes it was easier to be unorthodox than to be logically exact.

In regard to the Incarnation, we have had the advantage of a slight improvement in the translation of a passage in the seventh Ode, which we are now able to recognize as having been quoted by Eusebius. As we have already discussed the passage in the chapter on *Quotations from the Odes* in the early Fathers, it is only necessary to remind ourselves that the verses:

> 'He hath caused me to know Himself,
> Without grudging in His simplicity,
> Because His kindness hath minished His greatness.'
>
> *Ode* vii. 3.

are accurately reflected in Eusebius, who, in his comment on the 144th Psalm, speaks of Christ as

> τῆς θεότητος ὑποβὰς καὶ τοῦ συμφυοῦς μεγέθους ἑαυτὸν σμικρύνας.—Euseb. *D. E.* vi. 9, p. 267.

There can be no doubt that the verses in the Ode are descriptive of the Incarnation.

Enough has been said to show that the Odist is a person of no slight theological knowledge, and that the terms he employs are, for the most part, theologically correct.

It is increasingly clear that the Christology of the Odes is based (i) upon the prophecies, and those passages which were assumed to be prophetical, in the Old Testament; (ii) upon the descriptions of Wisdom in the Sapiential literature. Under the first head, as we have seen, the Psalms occupy an extraordinary place, and amongst the Psalms, such as have always been held to be Messianic. The 22nd Psalm in particular has thrown great light on the composition of the Odes. The Odes make Christ speak in his own person, and the language spoken is a reflection from the Psalms. This need not surprise us, for the same thing

Digitized by Google

which the Odist did in poetry the evangelical historian did in prose. We do not yet know whether those incidents in the Gospel which reflect the language of the 22nd Psalm, for example, are all of them genuine history; but we may be sure that in some cases the imagination of the writer has been assisted and the language found for him by the Psalms with which he was familiar, or which he may actually have studied for coincidence. Take, for example, St. Luke's allusion to the 'acquaintance of our Lord, who stood afar off' at the time of the Crucifixion: the incident is natural enough, but the language

εἱστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν,
Luke xxiii. 49,

is based on the Psalms: the margin of Nestle's New Testament carries the references (from Hort) to Psalms lxxxviii. 8, xxxviii. 11, and underlines as above, the precedence being given to Psalm lxxxviii. 9, which in the LXX is:

ἐμάκρυνας τοὺς γνωστούς μου ἀπ' ἐμοῦ·
ἔθεντό με βδέλυγμα ἑαυτοῖς·

This recognition of our Lord's 'acquaintance' in the narration of Luke helps us to the understanding of a difficult passage in the opening of the 42nd Ode, which runs as follows (the text had lost a clause in the Rylands MS. which we have restored from the Nitrian MS.):

'I became of no use to those who know me;
For I shall hide myself
From those who did not take hold of me;
And I shall be with those who love me.'

The speaker is certainly Christ, as was indicated in the *editio princeps* by a note attached to the opening clause. It is clear that the language is again that of the 88th Psalm; 'those who know

me' is *τοὺς γνωστούς μου* of the LXX: the words 'I became of no use' reflect

ἐγενήθην ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀβοήθητος,

in the sixth verse of the same Psalm, the opening clause of the Ode being *quam proxime* in Greek:

ἐγενήθην ὡς ἀβοήθητος τοῖς γνωστοῖς μου.

The Greek *ἀβοήθητος* in the sense of 'helpless' is not badly represented by the Syriac ܠܐ ܚܫܚܘ 'no use', and it is possible that here also we may be able to convict the Syriac of being secondary.

What is of more importance at this point is that we have found the clue to the interpretation and the composition of the Ode. The Psalm has been taken as prophetic of the Descent into Hades, an interpretation which is invited by the words

ἡ ζωή μου τῷ ᾅδῃ ἤγγισεν.

and which was commonly assumed to underlie the words

ἐν νεκροῖς ἐλεύθερος·

So in the Ode, the words 'I went down with him to its utmost depth', reflect Psalm lxxxvii (lxxxviii) 7:

ἔθεντό με ἐν λάκκῳ κατωτάτῳ·

We also have the key to the opening words of the Ode, for the Psalm tells us in the tenth verse:

καὶ ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ, κύριε, ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν·
διεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου·

So the opening words of the Ode in reference to the stretching out the hands and approaching the Lord, are to be either referred to Christ Himself, or they are anticipative and mimetic of one of the verses in the Psalm. 'the stretching out the hands being His sign', which the writer has identified in the Psalm.[1]

[1] We find the same quotation in *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili*, vi. 22.

Digitized by Google

That the Psalm in question early supplied Testimonies to the Death and Resurrection of Christ appears certain, though some leading exegetes like Theodoret (following, no doubt, the lead of Theodore) prefer to interpret the whole Psalm of the Jews in captivity.

In the *Testimonia* of Gregory of Nyssa, we find under the chapter on the Cross (cap. vii):

καὶ πάλιν· ἔθεντό με ἐν λάκκῳ κατωτάτῳ
(Psalm lxxxvii (lxxxviii) 7).

and in the chapter on the Resurrection (cap. viii):

καὶ πάλιν· ἐγενήθην ὡσεὶ ἄνθρωπος ἀβοήθητος, ἐν νεκροῖς ἐλεύθερος (Psalm lxxxvii (lxxxviii) 6.

Cyril of Jerusalem takes the whole Psalm to be spoken *ex ore Christi*, and refers to the words just quoted (see *Cat.* xiv. 8), which we have shown to underlie the speech of Christ in Ode xlii. 3.

Augustine also, commenting upon the Psalm, says:

'Let us therefore now hear the voice of Christ singing before us in prophecy, to whom His own choir should respond either in imitation or in thanksgiving.'

We said that it could be proved from the language of Cyril of Jerusalem, that the Odist believed Christ to be (1) Monogenēs or Only-Begotten; (2) Miraculously born. The passage which we were discussing was as follows:

'I was not their brother,
Nor my birth like theirs.'—*Ode* xxviii. 16.

The language is, at first sight, somewhat alien to the Spirit of the Incarnation: there is a touch of contempt mingled with its necessary superiority. It does not square with Paul's interpretation of Christ as the First-born among *many* brethren, nor with the writer to the Hebrews in saying that he took part in the flesh and blood of the children. It would be easier to find patristic parallels to the

Digitized by Google

second clause ('my birth not like theirs') than to the first clause, 'I was not their brother'. Let us see if we can find the key to the language. It is clear that the Odist is not speaking of Christ as the πρωτότοκος (the first stage of evolution of the Wisdom doctrine, according to which Wisdom was God's First-born, and Christ was the Wisdom of God): the alternative term to πρωτότοκος is μονογενής, the former representing Pauline Christology, the later Johannine. It can be shown that it is to this term μονογενής that the explanation belongs of the words 'I was not their brother', in the sense that the Only-Begotten has no brothers.

Suppose we turn, then, to the *Catechetical Lectures* of Cyril of Jerusalem: we find the following statements:

> 'A Son Only-Begotten, *having no other for His brother*; for therefore is He called Only-Begotten, *because He has no brother.*'—*Cat.* xi. 2.

> 'When thou hearest of the First-born, think not that this is according to men; *for the first-born among men may have other brothers also.*'—*Cat.* xi. 4.

> 'Neither has He who begat, a father, *nor He who is begotten, a brother* . . . . The Father being eternal, eternally and ineffably begat One Only Son, *who has no brother.*'—*Cat.* xi. 13.

> 'As there is One God the Father and no second Father: and as there is One Only-Begotten Son and Word of God, *who has no brother.*'—*Cat.* xvi. 3.

Thus, according to Cyril, we are to interpret 'Only-Begotten' in the sense of not having a brother; and even the term First-born has to be used judiciously for fear the conclusion should be drawn that Christ had brothers. We may, therefore, take it as the meaning of the Odist that Christ is the Only-Begotten and is miraculously born. This does not mean that the Odist is using St. John, but that he has a theology parallel to the Johannine. He is nearer to the Gospel of John than he is to the Epistle to the Colossians. Dependence, however, is not proved, for Monogenēs

Digitized by Google

is one of the terms that is taken over from the description of Wisdom, and not necessarily borrowed from the Gospel.

The difficulty of reconciling the two titles of Christ, *μονογενής* and *πρωτότοκος*, must have been felt very early: and it remained as an objection which heretics employed against the Nicene faith. Basil, in his treatise against Eunomius, meets the objection by saying that one can be first-born without introducing any brothers, for was not Christ called the *first-born son of the Virgin?*

> *ὥστε οὐκ ἀνάγκῃ ἀδελφοῦ πρωτότοκον λέγεσθαι.*

The objector's case was stated as follows:

> *εἰ πρωτότοκος ὁ Υἱός, οὐκέτι μονογενής· ἀλλ' ὀφείλει καὶ ἄλλος εἶναι, οὗ πρωτότοκος λέγεται.—Adv. Eunom.* iv (292 E).

It was assumed that *Monogenēs* meant *brotherless*: but first-born could not mean that.

Basil's argument was a mere evasion, for the terms in dispute were not used of the natural birth of Christ.

Up to this point the inquiry into the doctrine of Christ that is held by the Odist leads to the conclusion that it is Nicene in a nascent form. There is no doubt as to the pre-existence of Christ (Ode xli. 15, &c.) or to His pre-eminence; He is the Head of the Church and believers are His members (Ode xvii. 15, &c.). He is the Word of God (Ode xvi. 8, 19; xli. 11, 14; vii. 7; xii. 5, 12; xxxii. 2) and the Wisdom of God (Ode vii. 8; xli. 9); the unique Messiah miraculously born (Ode xxviii. 16). Against the Docetists the Odist is firm that the Christ is One (Ode xli. 15), against the Jews that He is the Lord (Ode xxix. 6).

There are, however, some elements of a heretical or incompletely developed character in the Odist's views. In two places, perhaps, the Christ is spoken of as one of the Divine Neighbours (Ode xxi. 7; xxxvi. 6), an expression which co-ordinates Him with the angels in rank; in the 36th Ode, the statement is made almost as in the Koran, where Jesus is called 'one of those that are near

Digitized by Google

to God'; and in that very same Ode we have the Odist's description of Christ as 'Most Glorified among the Glorious and Greatest among the Great Ones'. It will take some justifying to make these expressions theologically innocuous.

The Odist's doctrine of the Holy Spirit is, as we have already seen, so unorthodox in its subordination of the Spirit to the Son, that Ephrem had to alter it. In one place in the Ode already referred to (Ode xxxvi. 3) the Spirit is represented as the Mother of Christ! (we find a similar statement in Aphrahat, *Dem.* xviii, col. 840).

When we come to the Passion of Christ we do not find anything that we can call a doctrine of the Atonement in the Pauline sense of the word: he does not teach the forgiveness of sins, but only the abolition of ignorance, a very good doctrine and deserving a place in the creed, but not exactly the same as the other. The Odist is, however, well acquainted with the details of the Passion, especially where such details are accompanied by prophetical correspondence.

If the writer is un-Pauline in the matter of the sacrificial aspect of Christ's death, he is equally un-Pauline in the article of His resurrection. A single doubtful allusion exhausts his reference to it (Ode xxxi. 11). The fact is that he is like Bardaisan on the question of the Resurrection; he doesn't hold his doctrine of the future life in that form: we may call him unorthodox or not according to our predilections. The Odist believes in eternal life as attainable and attained in the present life; this reduces his doctrine of the last things almost to zero; it is possible, however, that in this direction we may find further reason for classifying him as a Johannine Christian, in view of the very limited eschatological outlook of the Fourth Gospel. If the Odist is weak on the article of the Resurrection he makes, on the other hand, a speciality of the Descent into Hades, as our notes will abundantly show.

Enough has been said to indicate the place of the Odist in schools of Christian thought.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VII

THE ODES AND THE BIBLICAL TARGUM.

WE find in the course of our examination into the linguistic phenomena which are offered by the Odes that there are cases, apparently of an indubitable character, where the Odes have come under the influence of the Targums; and if this can be established there are two directions in which the influence may have come into play: first of all, there is the natural and direct use of the Targum by a person who has a knowledge of the Hebrew language, or, at least, of its related Aramaic; second, there is a possible influence through the Syriac version of the Old Testament, which (like the Old Syriac Version of the New Testament) occasionally shows traces of a Targumist hand. Thus the question of Targumist influence is of importance in the determination of the original language of the Odes. If, for instance, there should be a probability that the original form of the Peshiṭta version of the Old Testament showed at any point the same trace of Targum that we find in the Odes, the natural conclusion would be that the Ode in question has imitated the Peshiṭta text, and is itself a Syriac product. If, however, any of the Odes, using Biblical matter, shows traces of the Targum, where the corresponding passage in the Peshiṭta does not show it, then (unless the Peshiṭta has corrected its Targumisms away) the Odist had access to the Targum outside the Peshiṭta, and may probably be independent of the Syriac version. We shall see presently how to apply these criteria. Meanwhile, if the traces of the Targum can be detected, we may say in advance that it is extremely improbable that the Odes were composed in Greek. It would almost reduce the choice of origins to Hebrew, Aramaic, or Syriac. We reserve, of course, the case of a bilingual writer, who should be at home both in Greek and in Semitic. How, then, shall we establish our statement as to the existence of cases of

Digitized by Google

Targumism in the Odes? For the detailed evidence in individual cases we must refer to the notes under the Odes in question: but some general statements may be made. The first suspicious case upon which we stumbled was in the first Ode of the collection, which showed an inner connexion with the first Psalm in the canonical Psalter, in its allusions to a never-withering and always fruitful crown upon the head of the Odist. 'His leaf also shall not wither', 'He brings forth his fruit in his season', being, in fact, a tree of righteousness, well-placed by abundant streams of water. Then, at the end of the Ode, came the obscure remark, 'Thy fruits are full and perfect, full of thy salvation'. The suggestion arose whether this could be the equivalent of the sentence in the first Psalm that 'whatsoever he doeth shall prosper'. Could the words 'he doeth' refer to the 'tree' which immediately precedes? In that case the 'doing' of the tree, as in the first chapter of Genesis ('tree of fruit, making fruit'), is the fruit that it produces. And if this fruit is prosperous the words 'full and perfect' are the natural comment. At this point we turn to the Targum and find that it has made this very explanation; and, curious to say, one-half of the explanation, the 'perfectness' of the fruit, survives in the text of the Peshiṭta, which does not, however, make it clear that it is the tree that is making a perfect product.

This is a very good case to begin with: it shows that there is a nexus between the Ode and the first Psalm in matter that is derived from the Targum or from the Syriac version in an early form of its tradition.

Now let us take another illustration. In Ode xxix. 8 the writer says that the Lord has given him 'the rod of His power':

ܚܘܛܪܐ ܕܫܘܠܛܢܗ

We recognize at once that this peculiar expression is taken from the 110th Psalm. On turning to the Peshiṭta text, we find a partial coincidence:

ܚܘܛܪܐ ܕܚܝܠܐ

the word for 'rod' is the same: the word for 'power' is different. If the Odist varies from the Syriac Psalm he varies equally from the Targum, with which the Syriac Psalter at this point agrees.

Using the result thus obtained of the dependence of the Odist upon the 110th Psalm, we see at once that there must be further coincidence or dependence; for the 'rod of power' in either case is to be used for the suppression of one's enemies. Then we observe a peculiarity of the Odist; his military operations are to be undertaken '*by the word* of the Lord', and victory over his enemies is attained through 'the Lord overthrowing them *by His Word*'. Should we write in our translation 'word' or 'Word'? We translated at first without a capital letter; but on looking at the first verse of the Psalm we find that 'the Lord said unto my Lord, sit still, &c., until I subdue thy enemies': and on turning to the Targum we find that 'the Lord said *by His Word*'; so we are led to use a capital letter, and to find the origin of the references in the Ode in question.

The case differs from the preceding in that there appears no trace of the Targum's expression in the Peshiṭta. In this way we are able to affirm that the language of the Odes is at certain points under the influence of the Targum on the Psalms: and if this conclusion is correct the observation will be far-reaching in character. We shall find our Odist in a Jewish area; he may even be a Judaeo-Christian. In one case at least we have shown an acquaintance with the Hebrew text as against its Targum (and the leading translations), for the Odist knows both the readings in Proverbs viii. 22, the 'Lord possessed me', and 'the Lord created me'. The former is the Hebrew reading: the latter that of the Targum, the LXX, and the Peshiṭta. Evidently we shall have to enlarge our idea of the scholarship of the author of the Odes; for he appears to be a scholar as well as a poet.

The recognition of occasional Targumic traces in the language of the Odes raises a further question; are there any instances of the influence of those devices which are employed by Targumists, in

Digitized by Google

order to avoid the repetition of the Divine Name, or to escape from describing the Divine action in human terms, such as attribute to the Lord 'hands, eyes, organs, and dimensions'? We have already referred to the leading instance of such substitution, in the introduction of the 'Word of God' in the 110th Psalm, and the reflex action from the Targum in the 29th Ode. Let us see if we can find traces of similar substitutions.

In Genesis iv. 14, 'Cain said unto the Lord .... Thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face shall I be hid.' Here the Targum first of all gets rid of the conversation between Cain and God, by substituting 'Cain said *before* the Lord', and then he has a double difficulty before him; (i) the reference to the face of God, (ii) the supposition that anything can be hidden from God. To avoid this he first replaces 'face of God' by 'from before God', and then he boldly says that 'it is impossible that I shall be hid'. We notice that the Targumist (Onkelos) objects to the 'face of God' and resorts to a circumlocution. Here we come across a curious feature of the Odes: the Odist on several occasions refers to the 'face of God', which sometimes comes in very awkwardly in the context, but he appears to have equated it in his mind with the Memra or Logos, so that the difficulty is got rid of in another way. Thus he says in Ode xxii. 11:

> 'Thy way was without corruption
> And thy Face:'

and in Ode xxv. 4:

> 'Thy Face was with me,
> Which saved me by thy grace.'

Here the expression 'thy Face' would not be used by a strict Targumist, but the Odist uses it of Christ, and does not find any difficulty in it. It has become for him one of the terms of a new and lawful vocabulary.

Digitized by Google

In order to see more clearly how the writer uses these *quasi*-Divine Names, we may compare Ode xv. 8, 9:

> 'I have put on incorruption through His Name,
> I have put off corruption by His grace:
> Death hath been destroyed before my Face:
> Sheol hath been abolished by my Word.'

Note the parallelisms between the 'Face' and the 'Word': it suggests that God is the speaker (through the prophet) in the last two lines, and that the Word is the Logos. We observe further that the Odist has another Targumist substitution in the use of the 'Name' of God, again, as it seems, as an equivalent of the Divine Word.

We may compare for this equivalence Ode xxii. 6:

> 'Thou wast there and didst help me:
> Everywhere *thy name* was a rampart to me.'

In another Ode the 'name' is thrown into parallelism with the Holy Spirit. Ode vi. 7:

> 'The praise of His name He gave us:
> Our spirits praise His Holy Spirit.'

A very interesting passage, charged with Targumic language, will be found in Ode xxxvi. 2:

> 'The Spirit made me stand on my feet in the high
> place of the Lord,
> Before His perfection and His glory.'

Here both of the terms 'perfection' and 'glory' are used as paraphrases for 'the Lord'; the 'glory' (יקיר or שׁכינא) is a common Targumic substitution. In the next line of the Ode the speaker is Christ, and the reserve in language is not necessary; accordingly the Odist says:

> 'The Spirit brought me forth
> Before the Face of the Lord.'

Digitized by Google

Here the language is proper *ex ore Christi*, but not proper (to the mind of the Targumist) for an ordinary person.

There is no doubt that the use of Targums has contributed to the religious language of the time and the place where they were current. A Targumist does not say 'God knows'; he says, 'It is revealed and known before the Holy One, blessed is He'. Thus in Genesis xlix. 16 Judah must not say, 'God hath found out the iniquity of thy servants'; he says instead, 'From before the Lord there has been found iniquity in thy servant.' Such expressions readily become conventional, at least among Aramaic-speaking peoples. They pass into the religious language of the time.

Accordingly, when the Odist in Ode iv. 12 wishes to say that God knew all that was going to happen to the Temple, he expresses it thus:

> 'The end was revealed to thee:
> ܚܪܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܟ
> All was revealed to thee as God.'
> ܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܓܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܟ

Notice, too, how the Odist reminds the Lord of the impossibility that He should repent of anything that He gave or designed. This is one of the crucial cases for a Targumist, who, when he finds in the Scripture that God repents of having made man, as in Genesis vi. 6, for example, resorts to the device of the 'Word' by whom God acts, and says:

> 'God repented in His Word that He had made man.'

Our Odist is equally sure that God could not change His mind: he is almost a Targumist, and moves in the circle of ideas to which Targums belong. A careful study of Targumic language will, no doubt, throw much light upon the language and the thought of the Odes.

For example, in Genesis iii. 5, the serpent says: 'God doth

Digitized by Google

know: ye shall be as God (אלהים) knowing good and evil.' This language would certainly offend the Odist who would say:

> 'Evil thou knowest not, neither doth it know thee.'
> Cf. *Ode* xviii. 9, 10.

The Targum evades the difficulty of translating Elohim as a real plural (and so does the Authorized Version): accordingly we have:

> 'It is revealed before God;
> . . . .
> Ye shall be as the magnates, knowing between good and evil.'

Here the word 'magnates' (רברבין) is meant to express the 'angels' or the 'heavenly beings'.

We notice it is the very expression which the Odist puts into the mouth of Christ in Ode xxxvi. 4:

> 'I was glorified amongst the glorious ones,
> And great amongst the magnates.'

The language of the Odist overlaps that of the Targum; they have much in common.

Perhaps enough has been said in support of the thesis that there is common matter (both in language and in ideas) between the Odist and the Targums. The Odist himself lives next door to the Synagogue and in the Jewish quarter.

CHAPTER VIII

Style of the Odes.

We can state with confidence that the Syriac style used in the Odes is not that of the Edessene productions represented by the Peshiṭta Version of the Old Testament, the *Hymn of the Soul* in the Acts of Thomas, the *Book of the Laws of Countries*, the

Digitized by Google

Acts of Thomas generally, the poetical works of Ephrem, &c. In all these works there is a certain freedom of writing and ease of expression which cannot be clearly detected in the Odes. Much of this harshness may, perhaps, be accounted for by the allegorical allusions which sometimes underlie the outer form of the words; but when every allowance is made under this head there remains always something which distinguishes the style of the Odes, say, from that of the canonical Psalter.

Two hypotheses may here be put forward: either the writer was working with a language which had not undergone a long period of development resulting in the fixity of the terms employed, or that he was translating from another language a text that was itself obscure; in this case, not wishing to indulge in countersense or nonsense, he might have tried to follow the original more closely than was consistent with a fine literary style. His choice of terms is, however, very happy, and one could with difficulty substitute a better lexicographical vocable for that adopted in his actual phrases. A Syriac scholar with a tried taste in Syriac language might perhaps reproach the Odist (or his translator) with an occasional weakness in the construction of a sentence, but not with a wrong use of a word. The terminology is, therefore, archaic, and certainly cannot be placed after the seventh century of our era, when foreign linguistic influences, already in existence, began to make themselves felt in a more accentuated manner in the Syriac language.

As an example to illustrate the first hypothesis we may quote the two terms used to express the 'Word', or the Johannine *λόγος*: ܦܬܓܡܐ (*pethghāma*) and ܡܠܬܐ (*melletha*). The first word, derived from a Persian root, is in classic Syriac used exclusively in the sense of *word* 'in concreto', i. e. vocable, sentence, order, answer; the second, which is employed in the Syriac New Testament to express the Johannine *λόγος*, has acquired in post-biblical Syriac, from the end of the second century onwards, the meaning of *word* 'in abstracto'. In reading the Odes we find that in two of them

Digitized by Google

(xvi and xli) ܡܠܬܐ is used to express 'Logos'; but this same λόγος is expressed by the inadequate ܦܬܓܡܐ in the Odes xii, xxxii. No *Christian* Syrian writer would have ever used, in speaking of Christ, such an unchristian and unevangelical expression if he were writing long after the end of the second century, i.e. after the vulgarization of the Syriac Gospels, any more than a modern English theologian would say that 'in the beginning was the vocable'.

It is certainly remarkable that the Syriac Odes should prefer to speak of Christ, the Word of God, under the term ܦܬܓܡܐ (*peth-ghāma*) rather than the term ܡܠܬܐ (*melletha*). It suggests an early date for the text when we find that so little regard is paid to the ecclesiastical use of terms. The use of *pethghāma* as an equivalent for *Logos* must have soon become obsolete under the influence of the Syriac Gospels; all through the Syriac literature the rendering of the Gospel of John, where λόγος = ܡܠܬܐ (*melletha*), is the conventional one. There is, however, a slight trace of the existence of a double translation in Syriac, corresponding to the usage of the Odes and to the Latin *Sermo* and *Verbum*: in Aphrahat (i. 389) we find Christ described as ܡܠܬܗ ܘܦܬܓܡܗ where two possible renderings stand side by side. And in the very same sequence (i. 392) there is a trace of a third attempt at the rendering of λόγος; for Aphrahat goes on to say that 'it is written, In the beginning was the Voice (ܩܠܐ *ḳāla*) which is the Word (*melletha*)'. In this connexion we must remark that in the prophetic Books of the Old Testament Peshiṭta the use of *melletha* and *pethghāma* alternates confusedly without any difference of meaning, because the Johannine and Christian conception of λόγος is not well developed at the time of their translation. On the hypothesis of a Greek original, the translator, believing the Odes to be the work of the Biblical Solomon, must have adopted the unsettled terminology of the Old Testament. On the other hand, would not this Syrian Christian translator have preferably used the word *melletha* to make the sentence more applicable to Christ, the *Word* of God?

Digitized by Google

The phraseology of the Syriac text in connexion with the word ܪܘܚܐ (= spirit *or* wind) deserves also special notice. In the Syriac Old Testament, when this term is applied exclusively to the wind or to the spirit of men and angels, it has commonly the feminine gender, and when applied to the Spirit of God it is also used more in the feminine than in the masculine gender, except in the expression ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ (holy spirit) where it is generally used in masculine (cf. Ps. li. 11, &c.). At the beginning of Christianity in the Syriac Churches, the Christian *Holy Spirit*, as constituting a personality distinct from God the Father, was frequently spoken of as feminine; it is so used by Aphrahat, by the old Syriac versions, and generally by Ephrem, possibly under the influence of Old Testament phraseology. To give the word a more orthodox meaning, when these versions were revised sometime in the second half of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century into the Peshiṭta, or Vulgate version of all the branches of the Syrian Church, the revisers changed it into masculine in John xiv. 17, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 13, 14; Luke xii. 12; but it has been retained as feminine in Luke i. 35, ii. 25, iii. 22, iv. 1; John vii. 39, and John i. 32 (but with the elimination of the word 'Holy').

After the fifth century, the expression 'Holy Spirit', ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ, Christian or Judaic, became conventionally masculine (cf. Eph. iv. 30, Pesh.); and the Christian *Holy Spirit* with ܪܘܚܐ alone, and to some extent with the expression ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ, is also commonly masculine, except in the passages where the wording is visibly inspired from the corresponding passages of the Peshiṭta and Ephrem. We give the only instances to the contrary with the adjective ܩܕܝܫܐ, and it is even possible that in two of these instances the 'Spirit of God' was understood by the translators in the sense of that of the Old Testament, and not of the Christian Holy Spirit, a person distinct from the Father. This is probably the case with Aphrahat (ii. 128), where ܪܘܚܗ ܚܝܬܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܬܐ (His Spirit) is used, and with the colophon to the Lewisian text (page 268, edit. Lewis), and with 1 Thessalonians iv. 8 (= Ezek. xxxviii. 14).

Digitized by Google

Possibly this could not be applied to Luke ii. 25–6 in the Lewisian text, where ܪܘܚܐ ܡܩܕܫܬܐ is employed. These are the only instances against the stereotyped formula which we have noticed in the Syriac literature. Probably one or two other instances have escaped our notice, but they will hardly counterbalance the thousands of examples which might be given to the contrary.

Coming to the Odes, we notice that the expression ܪܘܚܐ ܡܩܕܫܐ is used in the masculine in the stereotyped Syriac formula for the 'Holy Spirit', Judaic or Christian (see Odes vi. 7, xi. 2, xiv. 8, xxiii. 22 B). But in the famous Ode xix, which contains indubitable marks of the Christian 'Holy Spirit' outside the sphere of the stereotyped formula, we see the Holy Spirit spoken of as feminine. If the Syriac text had seen the light long after the sixth century we should have expected a more natural masculine use of ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ. Not once is the word used in the feminine in the works of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, translated from the Greek into Syriac by Jacob of Edessa about 698 (*Patrologia Orientalis*, iv. 1–94; viii. 100–280 et seq.).

On the other hand, there is a sentence which would suggest that the style of the Odes is dependent on that of the New Testament Peshiṭta. Ode xli. 15 has the expression ܠܬܪܡܝܬܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ 'the foundations of the world'. This is the Peshiṭta rendering of *καταβολὴ κόσμου* (cf. Matt. xiii. 35; John xii. 24; Ephes. i. 4). This coincidence, which is not to be lightly disregarded, is discussed in our note to the Ode in question and by E. A. Abbott in *The Fourfold Gospel*, p. 408 seq.; see also p. 122 of the present volume. Whether the phraseology of the Odes is dependent on the Syriac Old and New Testaments is discussed in another chapter. As far as the particularities of the Syriac text are concerned the philological notes placed at the end of every Ode may be found useful.

The subject being so intricate, it would be rash to attach the style of the Odes to that of a known group of authors, or a determined school of thought, and it would be highly precarious

Digitized by Google

to try to fix the epoch of their composition by the outward form of style.

On the one hand they certainly contain many of the elements which characterize a Syriac composition under Greek influences, and in this respect, were it not for some extraneous considerations arising chiefly (1) from a certain play on the different meanings of some Syriac words; (2) from the almost certain hypothesis that Ephrem (d. 373) knew them in their present form; (3) from a certain literary ascendency which the Syriac text possesses when compared with the Coptic translation and the Latin quotation of Lactantius—we should without hesitation have asserted that they were a translation from a Greek original. The only Syriac translations of Greek originals in the time preceding Ephrem, from which we can form a judgement as to the nature of early translations, are the Old Syriac Gospels; but the slight linguistic coincidences between the Odes and the Lewisian and Curetonian Versions do not seem to be sufficiently numerous to enable us to draw a safe conclusion of a constant relation between the style of the Odes and the style of the Gospels. Something, however, emerges clearly from an even superficial reading of the phraseology of the Odes, viz. that the difficulty of translation of some words lies not so much in their lexicographical or grammatical formation as in the precise meaning, sometimes hidden and mystical, which the author himself appears to have given them.

Everything well considered, there is much truth in F. C. Burkitt's verdict to the effect that no theory of the origin of these Odes is satisfactory which regards the Syriac translation (? text) that we possess otherwise than as an exotic. This is true if a comparison is established between the stylistic method of *Acta Thomae* (which, however important for a theologian, not many Syrians would consider as a model of Syriac composition) and the Odes, but it would somewhat exceed the boundaries of truth if that comparison were established with the writings of Sergius of Resh'aina, John of Ephesus, Jacob of Edessa, Maraba, Paul the Persian, &c.

Digitized by Google

In other words, Syrian authors with a Hellenic education write Syriac in a very different way from that of a man who knows no Greek. The *Acts of Judas Thomas* were written by a man who knew no Hellenic culture, and the works of Jacob of Edessa reflect the Hellenic education of their writer. A learned Syrian with a Hellenic education would write in a more grammatical Syriac than that used by Ephrem himself, would employ happier and more technical terms; but any one would notice that his style lacked that grace and flexibility which characterize a man without any exotic influence, such as Ephrem. The stiffness and the absence of characteristic native idiom, which would surely be found in the style of the former, would not prohibit our referring the composition to a real Syrian, who was writing in his own language.

Generally speaking the phraseology of the Odes is harmonious and correct, and stands in a very marked contrast with some extant Syriac translations of Greek originals, instances of which are found in the *Psalms of Solomon*, the *Geoponica*, the *Aphorisms of Hippocrates*, the *Didascalia*, &c. There are even sentences which could scarcely have been found in Greek thought or in Greek phrase. Ode xii. 6 has ܘܠܐ ܡܦܠ ܢܦܠ ܐܠܐ ܡܩܡ ܗܘ ܩܐܡ *And it* (*the Word*) *never falls, but standing He stands*, for 'He stands firmly and continually'; Ode xxviii. 4 has ܡܒܪܟܘ ܒܪܟܢܝ *He blessing blessed me* for 'He surely and frequently blessed me'. If the opinion held by all Semitists that the so-called *mimmed* infinitive used to give more emphasis to the verb is an undoubted Semitism, there is reason to believe that the instances above quoted, if not pure inventions of the unknown translator, are genuine marks of a Semite. Instances to the contrary are, however, numerous, and an examination of the early and late Syriac translations of Greek originals is instructive.

In the old Syriac Gospels, where the translated text is not so servile to the Greek as that of the Peshiṭta, this linguistic phenomenon occurs more than once; examples: Matt. ix. 24 (Lewis),

Digitized by Google

v. 32 (Lewis and Cureton); Luke viii. 50 and 53 (Cureton), xvi. 18 (Lewis), xxii. 15 (Lewis and Cureton); John vii. 47 (Lewis and Cureton).

In all these passages the revisers of the N.T. text have eliminated the *mimmed* infinitives, which are no more found in the Peshiṭta. The elimination has been effected as follows: ܕܡܘܬܐ (*bis*) for ܡܡܬ ܕܡܘܬܐ: ܐܙܠ (*bis*) for ܡܐܙܠ ܐܙܠ: ܗܘܘ ܡܫܡܫ for ܡܫܡܫܘ ܗܘܘ: ܢܦܫܗ ܢܦܫܐ for ܡܢ ܢܦܫܗ: ܠܡܫܡܥܗܘܢ for ܠܡܫܡܥܗܘܢ ܡܫܡܥܐ.

In all these examples the employment of the infinitive was facultative, and the revisers eliminated it: sometimes, however, it has been overlooked, and once it appears to have been retained because its position was necessary to the expression of the thought (see John ix. 9, x. 20, xiii. 29). The case is similar where the evangelist is quoting from the Old Testament where the phenomenon exists in the Hebrew and Syriac texts, as in Mark vii. 10, &c.

As far as the Syriac *Acts of the Apostles* and the *Pauline Epistles* are concerned, the use of the infinitive referred to above seems to be infrequent, and is generally confined to Biblical quotations from the Old Testament and to passages where a special stress is required by the Greek context, such as 2 Corinthians viii. 10, x. 9, xi. 7; Philippians i. 29; Romans xiv. 4 (as in Ode xii. 6). As we have already said, these phrases may be considered as remnants from the old Syriac Epistles, and for this reason they might not have been touched, out of respect for an ancient text.

The Syriac translations of the sixth century onwards offer very few instances of a constant use of this linguistic phenomenon, and for all practical purposes they may be left out of the question. We have not found it employed in the translation of the works of Severus of Antioch given in vol. viii of *Patr. Orient.* except on p. 245 in a quotation from 3 Kings xix. 10, which has no bearing on our case.

In the following example there may have been in the mind of the Odist the idea of a substantive derived from its verb, ܫܪܪܐ (*truth*) from ܫܪܪ (*to be firm*). This could hardly have been the case

Digitized by Google

if the author was a passive translator from a Greek original, because in this last language, the common word 'truth' is not derived from a common verb meaning to 'consolidate'.

ܘܐܫܬܪܪܬ ܥܠ ܟܐܦܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ

'And I was established (= confirmed) upon the rock of truth (= firmness)' (*Ode* xi. 5).

This phenomenon is to be carefully distinguished from the use of a noun of action or a mere substantive, with or without any preposition before or after the verb. Any Syriac book affords examples of such sentences, especially where the noun of action has constituted something like an inseparable expression with the verb from which it is derived. It will be useful for future investigation to give a list of all such phrases found in the Odes and Psalms of Solomon. They do not constitute by themselves an irrefragable token of Semitism, but their frequency in a work is a good guarantee that it emanates either from a Semite or from a man with Semitic learning and influenced by a Semitic Bible. It is a semi-play on words which is not to be completely disregarded.

(*a*) Examples with a preposition:

ܘܛܡܐܘ ܠܡܩܕܫܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܒܛܡܐܘܬܐ

'They defiled the sanctuary of the Lord with defilement.'
Ps. Sol. i. 8.

ܡܛܠ ܕܬܙܕܕܩ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܙܕܝܩܘܬܟ

'That thou mightest be justified, O God, by Thy justification.'
Ps. Sol. ix. 3.

ܩܝܡܐ ܐܩܝܡܬ

'Thou didst surely covenant.'—*Ps. Sol.* ix. 19.

ܘܐܬܟܣܝܬ ܒܟܣܝܬܐ

'I was covered with the covering.'—*Ode Sol.* xxv. 8.

ܘܢܢܗܪܘܢ ܐܦܝܢ ܒܢܘܗܪܗ

'Let our faces shine by His shining.'—*Ode Sol.* xli. 6.

Digitized by Google

ܢܪܘܙ ܡܢ ܕܪܘܙܗ

'Let us exult with His exultation.'—*Ode Sol.* xli. 7.

ܚܢܢܝ ܒܚܢܢܗ

'He pitied me in His pity.'—*Ode Sol.* vii. 10.

ܡܢ ܢܦܚܐ ܕܢܦܚ

'From the inspiration that He inspired.'—*Ode Sol.* xviii. 15.

ܘܐܝܟ ܚܘܕܬܗ ܚܕܬܢܝ

'Like His own newness He renewed me.'—*Ode Sol.* xxxvi. 5.

ܘܐܝܟ ܪܕܝܐ ܕܡܝܐ ܪܕܬ ܫܪܪܐ ܡܢ ܦܘܡܝ

'And like the flow of water flowed truth from my mouth.'
Ode Sol. xii. 2.

(*b*) Examples of a substantive or a noun of action:

ܣܝܡܬܐ ܕܚܝܐ ܣܐܡ ܠܗ

'Treasures him a treasure of life.'—*Ps. Sol.* ix. 9.

ܘܐܩܝܡܘ ܒܝܢܬܗܘܢ ܩܝܡܐ

'They covenanted covenants among themselves.'
Ps. Sol. viii. 11.

ܘܠܡܚܙܐ ܠܫܘܒܚܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܗܘ ܕܫܒܚܗ ܐܠܗܐ

'To see the glory of the Lord, wherewith
He had glorified him.'—*Ps. Sol.* xvii. 35.

ܘܚܝܘ ܒܡܝܐ ܚܝܐ

'They lived a life by the water.'—*Ode Sol.* v. 18.

ܡܩܪܒ ܐܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ

'I offer the offering.'—*Ode Sol.* xx. 2.

ܢܒܥ ܠܒܝ ܢܒܘܥܬܐ

'My heart gushes out a gush.'—*Ode Sol.* xxxvi. 7.

ܘܠܡܫܒܐ ܫܒܝܬܐ

'To lead captive a captivity.'—*Ode Sol.* x. 3.

Digitized by Google

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA

ܛܥܬ ܛܥܝܘܬܐ

'Error erred.'—*Ode Sol.* xxxi. 2.

Another phenomenon which goes to the credit of the Semitic origin of the Odes is the repetition of the same root as has occurred in a previous word of the sentence, although an interval may separate the two occurrences of the root. This is a proof of a continuous attention on the part of the Odist which in some cases is quite different from the function of a translator.

Examples:

ܘܣܒܪܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܣܪ̈ܝܩܐ ܕܪܒܐ ܗܝ: ܘܐܬܘ ܐܦ ܗܢܘܢ
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܘܬܗ̇ ܘܐܣܬܪܩܘ

'And *vain* people supposed that it was something great:
And they came to resemble it and *became vain*.'—*Ode* xviii. 12.

ܚܒܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܒܪܫܝܬ: ܘܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܚܒܠܗܘܢ
ܐܠܗܘܬܗܘܢ ܗܘܐ ܚܝ̈ܐ

'And they *travailed* from the beginning,
And the end of their *travail* was life.'—*Ode* xxiv. 8.

ܢܐܙܠܘܢ ܩܕܡܘܗܝ ܚܙܝ̈ܐ ܘܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܩܕܡܘܗܝ

'The *seers* shall go before Him,
And they shall be *seen* before Him.'—*Ode* vii. 18.

ܘܗܦܟܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܠܒܣܝܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܟ
ܘܐܗܦܟܘ ܡܪܪܐ ܕܐܝܠܢ̈ܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ

'And they *turn away* from wickedness to thy pleasantness:
And *have turned* from themselves, &c.'—*Ode* xi. 21.

ܢܬܦܪܩ ܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܥܡܟ
ܡܛܠ ܕܐܢܬ ܗܘ ܦܪܘܩܢ

'Let us also be *saved* with Thee:
For thou art our *Saviour*.'—*Ode* xlii. 18.

More important for all purposes is the play on the different meanings of a verb, or a noun. For example:

ܘܠܡܚܒܠܢܗ ܕܚܒܠܐ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܝܬ

'And I saw the *destroyer* of the *corruptor*.'—*Ode* xxxviii. 9.

Digitized by Google

ܘܐܬܚܙܝ ܒܪܫܗ ܪܫܐ ܕܐܬܓܠܝ

'And there was seen at its head
A head which was revealed.'—*Ode* xxiii. 18.

The first example, if translated by 'corruptor of the corruptor', or 'of the corruption', would scarcely yield any meaning; obviously its true meaning is, 'destroyer of the corruptor'. The author is therefore playing on the different meanings of the verb ܚܒܠ 'to destroy' and 'to corrupt'; he used it first in the sense of 'to destroy', and second in the sense of 'to corrupt', and this apart from his other play on the two different forms of the verbal participle. Curiously enough the same play on words occurs, but in a lesser degree, in 1 Corinthians iii. 17:

ܡܢ ܕܡܚܒܠ ܗܝܟܠܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܚܒܠ ܠܗ ܐܠܗܐ

'Him that *corrupts* the temple of God, God shall *destroy*.'

But this unique instance can hardly weaken the above statement.

In the second example the play is on the two meanings of the word ܪܫܐ, which means 'head', 'chief', and 'beginning', but as the meaning of the whole Ode is problematical it would not be safe to build much on a 'sealed letter', although at the first sight it would seem that the first ܪܫܐ is to be translated by 'beginning', and the second by 'head', or 'chief'. In Ode xxiv. 1 a play exists on the same word ܪܫܐ 'head' and 'head, superior', but this might have arisen also with the Greek κεφαλή.

Three other plays upon the different meanings of a word, in which a contrast is also established between these meanings, deserve consideration:

ܘܐܪܝܡܬ ܡܢܝ ܠܒ̈ܘܫܝ ܡܫܟܐ
ܡܛܠ ܕܝܡܝܢܟ ܐܪܝܡܬܢܝ

'I removed from me the raiment of skins
For thy right hand lifted me up.'—*Ode* xxv. 8, 9.

Digitized by Google

ܘܚܝܒܘܢܝ ܟܕ ܩܡܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܚܝܒ ܗܘܝܬ ܚܝܒܐ
ܘܦܠܓܘ ܒܙܬܝ ܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܝܒ ܠܗܘܢ

'And they made me a criminal when I rose up,
Me who had not been condemned.'

'And they divided my spoil,
Though nothing was due to them.'—*Ode* xxxi. 8, 9.

ܘܨܗܝܐ ܐܬܒܛܠ ܘܕܥܟ . . . . ܐܢܝܚܘ ܣܦܘ̈ܬܐ ܝܒ̈ܝܫܬܐ
ܘܨܒܝܢܐ ܕܡܫܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܩܝܡܘ.

'All the thirsty on earth were given a drink of it:
And thirst was done away and quenched . . . .
They have assuaged dry lips:
And the will that had fainted they have raised up.'
Ode vi. 11, 14.

In the first example ܐܪܝܡ with ܡܢ means 'take off', and ܐܪܝܡ alone means 'to extol, exalt, enhance'. The second example contains a contrast between 'to condemn', ܚܝܒܐ 'condemned, culprit', and ܐܬܚܝܒ ܠ 'something due to somebody'. The third example, although the two terms of the linguistic play are separated from each other, requires also careful examination on account of the corresponding Coptic text; the words are the verb ܐܬܒܛܠ 'to be dissolved, to perish', and the past participle ܡܫܪܝܐ 'paralytic'. The Coptic expresses also the same words by the same root.

A last linguistic feature worth mentioning is the tendency of the Odist to repeat the same verb in the same sentence with the substantive derived from it. For example:

ܗܝܡܢܬ ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܐܦ ܐܬܬܢܝܚܬ
ܡܛܠ ܕܡܗܝܡܢ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܗܝܡܢܬ ܒܗ

'I *believed*, therefore I was at rest:
For faithful is He in whom *I have believed*.'—*Ode* xxviii. 3.

Digitized by Google

ܘܠܐ ܐܫܟܚܘ ܠܟܠܝܘܗܝ ܡܟܠܝ̈ܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ
ܘܐܦܠܐ ܐܘܡܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܟܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܝܐ

'And the dykes (lit. *restrainments*) of men were not able *to restrain it*:
Nor the arts of those whose business it is *to restrain* waters.'
Ode vi. 9.

ܘܚܙܝܬ ܠܡܚܒܠܢܗ ܕܡܚܒܠܐ ܟܕ ܡܬܨܒܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܟܠܬܐ
ܕܡܚܒܠܐ ܘܚܬܢܐ ܕܡܚܒܠ ܘܡܬܚܒܠ

'And I saw the *Destroyer* of the *Corruptor*, when the Bride that was being *corrupted* was adorned, and the Bridegroom was *corrupting* and being *corrupted*.'—*Ode* xxxviii. 9.

ܘܐܣܬܟܠܘ ܡܕܥܬܝ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܒܫܪܪܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܝ

'And *understand my knowledge*,
Ye *who know me* in truth.'—*Ode* viii. 12.

ܛܪܘ ܐܪܙܝ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܢܛܪܝܢ ܒܗ
ܛܪܘ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܝ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܢܛܪܝܢ ܒܗ

'Keep my secret, ye who are kept by it
Keep my faith, ye who are kept by it.'—*Ode* viii. 10.

Apart from these general remarks upon the stylistic method of the Odist the following particular observations may be added as a corollary:

(1) Verbs are sometimes used in an absolute manner without any complements. For example:

ܠܐ ܐܬܚܒܠܬ ܐܝܟ ܐܬܚܫܒܘ
Ode xlii. 10.

ܐܬܡܙܓܬ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܫܟܚ ܪܚܡܐ ܠܗܘ ܪܚܡܐ
Ode iii. 7.

ܘܢܣܒܬ ܥܠܡܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ
ܗܢܘܢ ܕܢܣܒܝܢ ܒܡܘܡܠܝܘܬܗ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܝܡܝܢܐ
Ode xix. 5.

ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܕܥܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܢܐܒܕܘܢ
Ode ix. 7.

Digitized by Google

(2) In a contrast between terms, instead of a single verb expressing a negative, there is a tendency to use a positive word with the negative participle ܠܐ. For example:

ܠܒܫܬ ܠܐ ܚܒܠܐ ܒܝܕ ܫܡܗ
ܘܫܠܚܬ ܠܚܒܠܐ ܒܛܝܒܘܬܗ

Ode xv. 8.

ܐܬܚܒܠܬ ܠܗ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ
ܡܛܠ ܕܐܬܬ ܠܗ ܝܕܥܬܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ

Ode vii. 21.

Even without any contrast this phenomenon occurs with the words ܚܒܠܐ and ܝܕܥܬܐ in xviii. 11, xxxiii. 12; this feature, which answers to the privative *alpha* and the English prefix *un* or *in*, loses its value when it is preceded by a *dālath*, because in this case the word has exactly the English meaning of 'without'.

This contrast between terms by means of ܠܐ is, generally speaking, much used in Syriac literature, even by writers who knew no Greek, and no serious conclusion can be drawn from it in favour of an anti-Syriac original; one example from Ephrem will suffice:

ܝܕܥܬܗ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܝܬܘܬܗ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ

'His knowledge will become ignorance, and His existence non-existence.'—Mitchell, p. 173.

(3) The future tense is more frequently expressed by the aorist than by the verbal participle.

(4) The Odist has a marked predilection for the use of ܕܠܐ with a substantive; expressions such as 'without death', 'without corruption', for 'immortal', 'incorruptible'.

CHAPTER IX

The Style of the Odes and that of the Psalms of Solomon compared.

Since the two manuscripts of the Odes couple with them the Jewish *Psalms of Solomon*, it may be useful to examine whether in their stylistic form they resemble so closely each other that one could, on the hypothesis of a translation, safely ascribe both pieces to a single translator.

In the foregoing pages it has been pointed out that there is much in the Odes which would be explained by the supposition of Greek influence; this being the case we should, generally speaking, expect to find more harmony between the phraseology of the Odes and the Psalms than between, let us say, that of Ephrem or Aphrahat and the Odes. The difference between a work which is under Greek influence and another which is a direct translation from the Greek, is not as great as that which exists between the first work and the compositions of a genuine Syrian writer without any Hellenic culture. There need, therefore, be no wonder if a comparison between the style of early Edessene productions and that of the Odes and Psalms of Solomon should show that the Odes are nearer to the Psalms than to the Edessene productions. Notwithstanding all this, there are linguistic characteristics, some general and some particular, which suggest that both works could not have emanated from a single man.

General Characteristics.

1. The Psalms, contrary to the Odes, contain some obvious mistakes which point to a Greek original; scholars interested in the Syriac translations of Greek composition know that from A. D. 400 to 700 they were very literal, and even somewhat servile. The translators, out of respect for their text, used to follow it so closely that often they transgressed in a flagrant manner the

Digitized by Google

very rudiments of their language. The Psalms of Solomon offer a striking example to the point. In Psalm iii. 16 the translator, who was rendering literally the Greek sentence, used instead of ܢܬܛܠܩܘܢ in plural ܢܬܛܠܩ in singular, as it was before him in Greek, overlooking the fact that the subject of the verb, the word ܚܝܐ 'life', was only used in the plural, contrary to the Greek ζωή. The same mistake of translation, although in a lesser degree, occurs in the Peshiṭta rendering of John i. 4 ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν = ܒܗ ܚܝܐ ܗܘܐ.

2. All the above linguistic features which add to the value of the Syriac text of the Odes, and their correctness of style and the harmony between their sentences, are, generally speaking, absent in the Psalms. Further, some phrases of the Psalms suggest that they are a mediocre piece of work so far as the Syriac is concerned; and contain even expressions foreign to Syriac. For example:

ܘܥܠܘ ܒܫܘܒܚܗܘܢ

Ps. Sol. i. 5.

ܘܡܦܪܫ ܠܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܠܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܒܠܒܡ

Ps. Sol. ii. 35.

ܘܠܐ ܣܒܥ ܒܝܬܐ ܕܒܪ ܒܗ ܡܣܘܬܐ

Ps. Sol. iv. 13.

ܘܪܘܝ ܡܣܒܐ

Ps. Sol. viii. 17.

ܒܒܝܢܬ ܚܢܢ ܒܚܐܪܘܬܐ ܘܒܓܒܝܘܬܐ ܕܢܦܫ ܠܡܥܒܕ

Ps. Sol. ix. 7.

ܘܡܢ ܐܬܪܥܬ ܢܦܫ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܫܪܐܝܠ
ܐܠܘ ܠܐ ܡܥܕܪܐ ܒܪܘܚ

Ps. Sol. xvi. 3.

Digitized by Google

Particular Characteristics.

The difference between both styles will be more clearly understood in the case when the writer had the liberty of choice between two forms of verbs or two ways of expression. The case would be similar if in two Latin compositions the writer of both had used in one of them the form *amaverunt* in exclusion of *amavere*, or *vice versa*. If many such divergent forms occur in a pair of writings which are under consideration there is reason to believe that their author was not the same man. A cumulative evidence by many grammatical licenses of this kind would suggest that it would at least be highly precarious to assign both pieces to a single man; *le style c'est l'homme*.

Here are the main stylistic ways of expression which characterize the Psalms and the Odes, and seem to separate both compositions from each other.

1. The Odes, but not the Psalms, have used a conjugated ܗܘܐ with the principal verb to express indicative and subjunctive. For example:

ܘܢܝܚܐ ܕܡܛܠܠܐ ܐܘܩܡ ܥܠܠܐ ܡܢ ܪܫܝ
ܕܗܘܬ ܡܣܝܥܐ ܠܝ ܒܟܠܡ

Ode xxxv. 1, 2.

ܘܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܬܦܪܢܣܝܢ ܒ ܒܫܪܝܪ

Ode xxxviii. 14.

ܡܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܢܗܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܡܬܬܥܫܢܝܢ ܠܟܘܢ

Ode xxxix. 8.

ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܥܠܠ ܡܛܘܠܬܢ

Ode xlii. 14.

2. The Psalms, but not the Odes, have used the otiose corroborative with both pronouns and ܕܝܠ declined. For example:

ܡܘܗܒܬܟ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܟ

Ps. Sol. v. 16.

Digitized by Google

ܒܚܘܒܝܢ ܕܝܠܢ

Ps. Sol. ix. 3.

3. The Psalms, but not the Odes, have used the apocopated form of pronouns with the declined verbal participle. For example:

ܠܡܢܐ ܕܡܟܬ ܢܦܫ ܘܠܐ ܡܒܪܟܬ

Ps. Sol. iii. 1.

ܐܘ ܡܢܘ ܢܣܒ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܕܥܒܕܬ

Ps. Sol. v. 5.

4. The Psalms, but not the Odes, have used the third person plural with the form of the paragogic *nun*. For example:

ܘܒܢ̈ܬܗ ܕܐܘܪܫܠܡ ܐܬܛܡ̈ܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡ̈ܬܝܢ

Ps. Sol. ii. 14.

5. The Psalms, but not the Odes, have used an otiose *waw*:

ܢܦܠ ܘܡܛܠ ܕܒܝܫܐ ܡܦܘܠܬܗ ܘܠܐ ܢܩܘܡ

'He falls and because his fall is grievous, (and) he rises not again.'—*Ps. Sol.* iii. 13.

ܘܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܬܢܐ ܠܡܘܗܒܬܗ ܘܠܐ ܢܪܛܢ ܘܗܘܝܐ ܠܬܗܪܐ ܗܘ

'And if it should be that he repeats his gift,
And does not grumble, (and) that is a wonder.'

Ps. Sol. v. 15.

ܘܟܠ ܫܐܠܬܐ ܕܢܦܫܐ ܕܡܬܬܟܠܐ ܒܗ ܘܡܫܡܠܐ ܡܪܝܐ

'And every petition of the soul that trusts in Him, (and) the Lord fulfils it.'—*Ps. Sol.* vi. 8.

6. The Odes, and not the Psalms, have put the *mimmed* infinitive after the object:

ܘܚܝܠܐ ܕܓܢܒܪ̈ܐ ܠܡܡܟܟܘ

'And the power of the men of might to bring down.'

Ode xxix. 8.

Digitized by Google

ܘܙܟܘܬܐ ܠܡܣܒ ܒܚܝܠܗ

'And victory to take by His power.'—*Ode* xxix. 9.

On the other hand some identical constructions of sentences are found in both Psalms and Odes, possibly owing to the fact that no other reasonable ways of expression were available. Of this category are to be counted:

1. The comparison between two objects by means of ܐܝܟ and ܗܟܢܐ, 'as . . . . . . so . . . . ;' see *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 2, &c., and Ode vii. 1, &c.

2. The use of ܡܢ and ܘܠܥܕܡܐ, 'from . . . . . to . . . ;' see *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 21, &c., and Odes xi. 4, xxvi. 7. Ode vii. 14 has, however, ܠܥܕܡܐ only without *waw*.

These are the main points of similarity and dissimilarity between the style of the Odes and that of the Psalms. Although the linguistic features which distinguish both compositions from each other are not very striking there is sufficient evidence to show that they emanate from two different writers.

CHAPTER X

The Biblical Quotations of the Odes.

The question of the Biblical quotations found in the Odes is very important, involving as it does many interesting points in regard to their age, their original language, and the country in which they were written. Unfortunately, as very few quotations can clearly be singled out in the Odes, their total effect is somewhat impaired. There are, however, some unmistakeable semi-quotations drawn from the Scriptures which bring the whole collection into relation with an extensive Biblical nucleus. Now if these semi-quotations are in harmony with the LXX there is reason for believing that the Odes which contain them were originally written

Digitized by Google

in Greek; if, on the contrary, there are linguistic features which suggest their dependence on the Hebrew text, it would not be very rash to state that their first author was a Judaizing writer, who availed himself of the Scriptural text with which he was familiar in his Synagogues or in his Church. Finally, if these quotations agree with the Peshiṭta Version of the Syriac speaking churches, there would be ample justification for the belief that the Odist, or, at least, his translator, was drawing his phraseology from a text with which he was already acquainted.

An English theologian of the twentieth century, when quoting Psalm i. 4, or translating a Latin book in which the verse is quoted, would hardly say, 'But are as the stubble that the wind carrieth away', but would very probably, as far as the text which he is translating would allow, use 'chaff' for 'stubble', and 'driveth away' for 'carrieth away'. As a matter of fact, this very verse is quoted in Ode xxix. 10, where the verb ܕܪܐ of the Peshiṭta is superseded by ܢܫܒܐ, the writing of both being as follows:

Peshiṭta: ܐܝܟ ܡܘܪܐ ܕܕܪܐ ܪܘܚܐ

Odes: ܐܝܟ ܡܘܪܐ ܕܢܫܒܐ ܠܗ ܪܘܚܐ

It is worth noting that a semi-quotation of this verse by Aphrahat has also ܢܫܒܐ for ܕܪܐ (ii. 117).

Verses like this are numerous; the most striking parallelisms and coincidences are the following:

Ode xxvi. 11: ܡܢܘ ܡܫܟܚ ܕܢܬܪܓܡ ܬܕܡܪܬܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ

'Who is able to interpret the wonders of the Lord?'; and Psalm cvi (cvii). 2, which is quoted here, has: ܡܢܘ ܢܫܬܥܐ ܬܕܡܪܬܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ with a change of the verb ܐܫܬܥܝ into ܐܬܪܓܡ, and the addition of the verb ܡܫܟܚ, the position of which is facultative in interrogative and admirative sentences combined. The idea of 'interpretation of the wonders of the Lord' occurs several times in the canonical Psalter, and it is always translated in the Peshiṭta by ܐܫܬܥܝ ܬܕܡܪܬܐ (see Pss. ix. 15, xxviii. 4, cv. 2).

Digitized by Google

Ode xxix. 8 .has ܫܒܛܐ ܕܚܝܠܬܢܘܬܗ 'The rod of His power'. This rod of power occurs in the canonical Psalter (Ps. cx. 2), and is there expressed by the Peshiṭta as ܫܒܛܐ ܕܥܘܫܢܐ. Note the change of the language of the Psalter.

Ode xxvi. 4 has ܐܩܥܐ ܠܘܬܗ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܠܒܝ 'I will cry unto Him with my whole heart'. The idea of crying from one's whole heart is in Psalm cxviii. 145, where it is expressed in the Peshiṭta with the verb ܩܪܐ, and not ܩܥܐ as in the Odes.

Ode v. 8 has ܐܬܚܫܒܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܘܠܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗܘܢ 'For they devised a counsel, and it has come to nought' (lit. it has not been for them). The idea of 'devising' a counsel which does not succeed is in Psalm xxi. 11, where it is expressed by the Peshiṭta as follows: ܐܬܚܫܒܘ ܡܠܟܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܫܟܚܘ ܚܝܠܐ with the substitution of ܘܠܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗܘܢ for ܘܠܐ ܐܫܟܚܘ ܚܝܠܐ.

Ode xxx. 4 has ܡܢ ܕܒܫܐ ܚܠܐ ܣܓܝ ܒܣܝܡܝܢ ܡܝ̈ܘܗܝ 'Much sweeter is its water than honey'. A parallel sentence of Psalm xix. 10 is as follows: ܘܚܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܕܒܫܐ 'And sweeter than honey'. The Odes have changed ܚܠܝܢ to ܒܣܝܡܝܢ.

In some other verses, the same words are used in the Odes as those found in the canonical Psalms. Generally, however, this happens in the case when another word could hardly be substituted for that used in both compositions; further, in most of these occurrences, the Odist seems to have purposely changed the nature of the text from which he was drawing his inspiration. For example:

Ode v. 11 : ܘܡܛܠ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܗܘ ܦܘܪܩܢܝ ܠܐ ܐܕܚܠ 'And because the Lord is my salvation, I will not fear.'

And Psalm xxvii. 1 : ܡܪܝܐ . . . . ܦܘܪܩܢܝ ܡܢ ܡܢ ܐܕܚܠ 'The Lord is my . . . . salvation, whom shall I fear?'

Ode xxix. 1, has ܡܪܝܐ ܗܘ ܣܒܪܝ ܠܐ ܐܒܗܬ ܒܗ 'The Lord is my hope, in Him I shall not be confounded;'

Digitized by Google

and in several passages of the Psalms the sentence is constructed as follows:

ܒܡܪܝܐ ܣܒܪܬ ܠܐ ܐܒܗܬ 'In the Lord I put my hope, I shall not be confounded' (Pss. xxii. 5, xxv. 2, xxxi. 1, lxxi. 1, &c.).

Ode xvii. 9 has ܘܓܕܥܬ ܡܘ̈ܩܠܐ ܕܦܪܙܠܐ 'And I broke in pieces the bars of iron'; and Psalm cvii. 16 has ܘܡܘ̈ܩܠܐ ܕܦܪܙܠܐ ܓܕܥ 'And he has broken in pieces the bars of iron'. Cf. also Isaiah xlv. 2.

Ode xxviii. 13 has ܘܚܕܪܘܢܝ ܐܝܟ ܟܠܒ̈ܐ ܦܩܪ̈ܐ 'And they came round me like mad dogs'; and Psalm xxii. 16, from which the idea is drawn, has ܚܕܪܘܢܝ ܟܠܒ̈ܐ 'Dogs came round me'.

Ode xxix. 11 has ܡܛܠ ܕܐܪܝܡܗ ܠܥܒܕܗ ܘܠܒܪܗ ܕܐܡܬܗ 'Because He exalted His servant and the son of His handmaid'. The idea of 'servant and son of handmaid' is in Psalm cxv. 16, where it is expressed ܥܒܕܟ ܐܢܐ ܘܒܪܗ ܕܐܡܬܟ 'I am thy servant and son of thy handmaid'. There was possibly no other way to express such an idea in Syriac.

In some verses the change of words between the phraseology of the canonical Psalms and that of the Odes is confined to a particle or to a facultative way of expressing the comparative or superlative. For example: Ode iv. 5 has, 'For one hour of thy faith is more precious (= better) than all days and years'. There is probably a relation between this verse and Psalm lxxxiv. 10, which has: 'For a day in thy courts is better (= more precious) than a thousand.' The Odes express the Syriac comparative 'better' or 'more precious' with ܡܝܬܪ instead of that of ܛܒ used in the Psalms. Ode xiv. 1 has ܐܝܟ ܥܝܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܒܪܐ ܥܠ ܐܒܘܗܝ 'As the eyes of a son to his father.' The verse has a certain relation with Psalm cxxiii. 2, which has three times the particle ܠܘܬ instead of ܥܠ of the Odes, and in no case any attempt is made to put the suffix pronouns at the end of ܥܝܢ̈ܐ. One of these three cases is: ܐܝܟ ܥܝܢ̈ܐ ܕܥܒܕ̈ܐ ܠܘܬ ܡܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ 'As the eyes of servants to their masters'.

The idea that a mischief should return upon the head of those

Digitized by Google

who do it is expressed in Psalm vii. 16, and in Ode v. 7. The difference in phraseology is in the use of the preposition 'upon', which follows the verb ܗܦܟ. This preposition is ܥܠ in the Odes, and ܒ in the Psalms.

In Ode xxxviii. 1 the starting-point of the thought is undoubtedly Psalm xlii (xliii). 3, where God is implored to 'send out His *Light* and His *Truth*, that they may *lead* me and *bring* me to His holy mountain'. In the LXX of the Psalm the Hebrew tenses have been rendered by the past tenses,

αὐτά με ὡδήγησαν καὶ ἤγαγόν με·

which makes even closer agreement with the Ode. In the Peshiṭta version the coincidences have almost disappeared. Instead of 'Truth' it has 'Faith', instead of 'lead me' it has 'comfort me'.

In Ode xiv. 4, 5 we have distinct traces of the influence of Psalm xlvii (xlviii). 15, and Psalm xxx (xxxi). 4. The Odist prays that the Lord may be his guide even to the end (ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܚܪܬܐ), he has substituted 'the end' for 'death', but agrees with the Hebrew and its dependent Peshiṭta in the use of the verb ܕܒܪ ('to guide'), while the LXX has the more remote *ποιμανεῖ*. After the manner of the Odist we have in the next verse the influence of Psalm xxx (xxxi), '*For thy name's sake* lead me and guide me', where the Peshiṭta does not mention the idea of guidance, which is involved in the Hebrew and the LXX. Here again the Odist shows independence of the Peshiṭta tradition.

In Ode xxviii we have signalized a reference to the 22nd Psalm in the 'mad dogs who come round their master'; a further reference from the same Psalm, 'they *cast lots* for my vesture', will be found in the seventeenth verse of the Ode:

'Vainly did they *cast lots* against me.'

In the next verse of the Ode, the Odist appears to be drawing upon Psalm cxviii (cxix). 161:

'Princes *persecuted me without a cause*' (*κατεδίωξάν με δωρεάν*),

Digitized by Google

for which the Ode has:

ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܘܘ ܒܠܒܗ ܗܘܘ ܡܝܬܝܢ.

The Peshiṭta of the Psalm has:

ܕܢܩܘܡ ܡܢ ܡܝܬܘܬܐ

These are the most striking parallels and semi-quotations which attract the attention of the reader of the Odes in relation to the canonical Psalter.

In leaving the Psalms for the purpose of consulting some other prophetical books of the Old Testament, we shall find that such parallels and semi-quotations are less numerous and less significant. The most striking are the following:

Ode viii. 21 has ܘܐܙܠܐ ܩܘܕܡܝܗܘܢ ܙܕܝܩܘܬܝ 'And my righteousness goes before them'. This is related to Isaiah lviii. 8 ܘܐܙܠܐ ܩܕܡܝܟ ܙܕܝܩܘܬܟ 'And thy righteousness shall go before thee', with the change of ܩܕܡ of the Peshiṭta to ܩܘܕܡ of the Odes.

Ode xxii. 9 has ܓܪ̈ܡܐ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܘܩܪܡܬ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ ܦܓܪ̈ܐ 'Dead bones, and it covered them with bodies'. This is possibly under the influence of Ezekiel xxxvii. 4–6:

ܓܪ̈ܡܐ ܝܒܝ̈ܫܐ . . . ܘܐܩܪܘܡ ܥܠܝܟܘܢ ܡܫܟܐ

'Dry bones . . . . and I will cover you with skin.'

The changes of ܝܒܝ̈ܫܐ 'dry' into ܡܝ̈ܬܐ 'dead', and of ܦܓܪ̈ܐ 'bodies' into ܡܫܟܐ 'skin', is probably due to the Odist himself, and has, therefore, no bearing upon the phraseology of the Syriac text.

In Ode xii. 3, 11 we have allusions to Wisdom as being the *Mouth of the Lord*, or the *Mouth of the Most High*, which are parallel to the language of Sirach xxiv. 3 sqq.

We compare:

Ode xii. 3: ܡܛܠ ܕܦܘܡܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܫܪܝܪܐ

and Ode xii. 11: ܡܛܠ ܕܡܠܠ ܠܗܘܢ ܦܘܡܗ ܕܡܪܝܡܐ

with Sirach xxiv. 3 ἐγὼ ἀπὸ στόματος Ὑψίστου ἐξῆλθον.

The Peshiṭta of Sirach has ܕܥܠܝܐ where again we see the Odist

to be independent of the Peshiṭta. The whole of the 12th Ode is a Wisdom composition, showing striking parallelism with the *Praises of Wisdom* in Sirach xxiv.

In Ode xxiii. 1–3 the song is based directly upon some sentences in the Wisdom of Solomon iii. 9 and iv. 15. Thus we have for a parallel to the statements that

> 'Grace (ܛܝܒܘܬܐ) is of the elect (ܕܓܒܝܐ); and Love (ܚܘܒܐ) is of the elect; and who shall receive it but those who have trusted (ܕܐܬܬܟܠܘ) in it,'

in the verses *Sap. Sol.* iii. 9:

> *οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτῷ συνήσουσιν ἀλήθειαν·*
> *καὶ οἱ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσμενοῦσιν αὐτῷ·*
> *ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ.*

The underlined Greek words agree with the language of the Ode, and are reflected exactly in the Peshiṭta. It is to be remarked that the coincidence is here so exact between the language of the Ode and the Peshiṭta.

In the 20th Ode there is a recurrent allusion to the language of Isaiah lviii to which an indisputable reference had already been made in the eighth Ode ('Thy righteousness shall go before thee'). In the 20th Ode this has been modified to 'His glory shall go before thee'; and if this parallelism be admitted for Ode xx. 9 with Isaiah lviii. 8 we can hardly avoid recognizing some allusion to Isaiah lviii. 7 in the somewhat obscure verse in Ode xx. 6. Here, then, the parallel will be made with:

> 'When thou seest the naked that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thy own flesh: then shall thy light break forth as the morning and thy healing shall spring forth speedily, and thy righteousness shall go forth before thee.'

This reference, however, does not supply all that the Odist has in mind: his naked person is the one who has left his garment in pledge. This comes from Exodus xxii. 24–6, where the pledged garment must be restored before sundown, because it is the covering

Digitized by Google

of a man's nakedness. It is not easy to find close coincidences of language between the Ode and either the LXX or the Peshiṭta: the underlying ideas, however, seem to be the same.

These are the most obvious Biblical semi-quotations. It is noticeable that their phraseology in the Odes is not always in accordance with the wording of the Old Testament Syriac. As far as the sense of the sentences is concerned we cannot know from them the kind of text the Odist was using; because in some cases this sense is exactly the same in Hebrew, Greek, and Syriac; but as far as the wording is concerned the divergences are sometimes striking, and frequently more noticeable in the case where the quoted phrase has more the form of a real citation than of a mere inspiration, and this is all the more worthy of consideration.

It should be noted that in a few Syriac translations of Greek originals, the wording of the sentence does not resemble that of the Old Testament Peshiṭta; this is especially the case with the homilies of Severus of Antioch, translated by Jacob of Edessa (*Patr. Or.* iv, viii). This anomaly may frequently be explained by the fact that the text of the Septuagint had a meaning which that of the Peshiṭta could not exactly render, and the translator not wishing to weaken the statement of the first writer, translated literally the terminology which was before him, even to the detriment of his own Version of the Bible. It is a well-known fact that Syrian authors were fond of literal translation.

Outside the sphere of the Syriac phraseology, some quotations seem to suggest that the Odist was using the Hebrew text rather than the Septuagint. Verse 4 of Psalm i quoted above is in Hebrew: אם־כמץ אשר תדפנו רוח, which strictly means 'Like the chaff which the wind driveth away'. In the Septuagint the text is longer and paraphrastic at the end:

ἀλλ' ἢ ὡς ὁ χνοῦς ὃν ἐκρίπτει ὁ ἄνεμος ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς.

The Syriac ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܥܘܪܐ ܕܕܪܐ ܪܘܚܐ is exactly the Hebrew text faithfully translated. The sentence of Ode xxix. 10, in which the

Digitized by Google

text is quoted, is in complete harmony with the Hebrew and with the Peshiṭta, except in the wording of the phrase where ܕܚܡܠܐ is used for ܕܕܪ̈ܐ; but it obviously lacks the additional sentence *ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς*. One might, perhaps, say that if the Odist was using the LXX he would have added these final and additional words in a way similar to the following: ܡܢ ܐܦܝ ܐܪܥܐ 'From the face of the earth'. (The Vulgate is in accordance with the LXX in exhibiting *a facie terrae*.) The Hebrew, the Targums, and the Peshiṭta are at one against the LXX and its dependent Vulgate; and the Odes follow the first group of texts.

The twelfth verse of Psalm xxi, is in Hebrew חשבו מזמה בל יוכלו 'they have devised a counsel, but they were not able' (to perform it). In the LXX and the Vulgate the idea of performing the counsel which underlies the Hebrew sentence, but which is not expressed in words, is stated as follows: *διελογίσαντο βουλὴν ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνωνται στῆσαι* and 'cogitaverunt consilia quae non potuerunt stabilire'. The word *στῆσαι* (*stabilire*) is not expressed in Hebrew. The Syriac Peshiṭta and the Targums are exactly like the Hebrew except that the Targums paraphrase the word מזמה and add the suffix 'thee' at the end of the last verb. The sentence of Ode v. 8 is more in harmony with the Hebrew and the Peshiṭta than with the LXX, but instead of ܘܠܐ ܐܫܟܚܘ ܫܠܐ 'and they were not able' it exhibits ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ 'and it did not succeed for them', or simply 'they were not able'.[1]

The Ode, therefore, is in harmony with the Hebrew, the Peshiṭta, and the Targums, against the Septuagint and the Vulgate, in not expressing the idea of *stabilire*.

Some verses seem to suggest remotely a borrowing from the Hebrew text and not from the Peshiṭta and Septuagint. In Ode xli. 9 the Christ says: 'For the Father of Truth remembered me, He who possessed me from the beginning.' In Proverbs viii. 22, Wisdom says: 'The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His

[1] The Syrians frequently say ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ ܕܐܥܒܕ ܗܕܐ 'I was not able to do this'. This expression may even be considered as a Syriacism.

Digitized by Google

ways.' If there is any relation between these two verses the Biblical thought must have come to the mind of the Odist through the Hebrew text, because all the Versions of the Bible, except the Vulgate, convey the idea of *creation*, and not of *possession*; Peshiṭta ܒܪܢܝ; the Targums בראני; the Septuagint ἔκτισέν με; but the Hebrew קנני and the Vulgate *possedit me*. We must observe, however, that the alternative reading in Proverbs viii. 22 has also found a place in our Odes; in Ode vii. 8 we are told that 'He who has *created* Wisdom is wiser than His works', which implies the reading of the LXX (ἔκτισέν με). The author of the Odes must, therefore, be credited with a knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek texts. This is especially interesting because the Greek Church did not get back to the Hebrew reading before the time of Eusebius and the Arian controversy. A case of no slight interest occurs in Ode xxv. 4, where the Odist says:

> 'Thy Face was with me,
> He who saved me by thy grace.'

The peculiar expression 'Thy Face' is due to Exodus xxxiii. 14, where God promises Moses that *His presence* will go with him, and that He will give him rest. Here the word which is commonly rendered 'presence' is in the Hebrew 'Face'. This 'Face of God' which accompanied Israel was identified by the early Christians with Christ, the Angel of the Covenant. It was an awkward expression for those who wished to avoid anthropomorphic representations of Deity, especially in view of the statement that no man can see the Face of God. Accordingly the Septuagint replace the Hebrew expression, and say, 'I myself will go before thee'; while the Peshiṭta alters it into an injunction to 'walk before me'. When we turn to the Targum of Onkelos, we find that the 'Shekinah' replaces the 'Face'. Even more curious is the manipulation of the passage by the Targum of Jonathan. Apparently the Odist is working from the Hebrew, with whose text he is directly acquainted. If our explanation is correct the Odist at this point does not Targumize. Possibly the Odist also has in

Digitized by Google

mind Genesis xxxii. 30, 'I have seen God face to face, and my life *has been saved*'. Here the Targums and the Peshiṭta replace the God whose face is seen by the Angel of God.

On the other hand, verse 11 of Ode xxvi: 'Who is able to interpret the wonders of the Lord?' is more in harmony with the Targums than with any other version of Ps. cvi [cvii]. 2, because all the versions, including the Hebrew text, omit the verb, 'Who is able', which is clearly expressed in the Targum by מן יכל למללא.

Many similar cases of dependence of the Odist upon the Targums are treated elsewhere.

The only verse in the Odes which offers a definite savour of a borrowing from the Septuagint is the following: 'An everlasting crown is Truth; blessed are those who set it on their heads; a stone of great price it is' (ii. 8, 9). In Psalm xx. 4 mention is made of a crown which the Hebrew expresses as עטרת פז 'the crown of *paz*'.[1] The Peshiṭta rendering of *paz* is ܡܫܒܚܐ, 'glorious' crown. The Septuagint understood it in the sense of a 'crown of precious stones', *στέφανον ἐκ λίθου τιμίου*. Since no other mention is made in the Old Testament of a crown of precious stones it is clear that this verse of the Psalms was in the mind of the Odist, who, in this case, would have worked on it in explaining the nature of the crown which it contained. But on this point *v. infra*.

Coming to the semi-quotations from the New Testament we notice that we are less fortunate in our investigations, because although many thoughts expressed in the Odes are found in some passages of Johannine and Pauline writings, yet no clear borrowing of a complete sentence can be singled out. These identical thoughts in the Odes and in the New Testament are more of the nature of parallels than of any form of quotation. The verses which can be better paralleled with statements found in the New Testament are the following:

[1] The origin of this word, which sounds more Persian than Semitic, is problematic; we may compare the Arabo-Persian بز *baz* 'rich dress', 'fine linen'. In default of a better sense the English Bible has rendered it by 'pure gold'.

Digitized by Google

Ode xxii. 12 says, 'And that the foundations of everything might be thy rock (*or* stone); and on it Thou didst build thy Kingdom.' Matthew xvi. 18 has: 'Thou art Cephas, and upon this rock (*or* stone) I will build my Church . . . And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.' In both texts the words used to express 'to build' ܒܢܐ, 'Kingdom' ܡܠܟܘܬܐ, and 'stone' ܟܐܦܐ, are identical.

Ode xxix. 8 has: 'That I might subdue the imagination of the people and to bring down the power of the men of might'; and Luke i. 51–2 says: 'He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts; he hath put down the mighty from their seats.' The words which in these quotations are nearest to one another are those which express the idea of 'to lower'—in the Odes ܡܟܟ, and in the Syriac Gospel ܣܚܦ (Peshitta), ܐܚܬ (Lewisian); and 'imagination'—in the Odes ܡܚܫܒܬܐ, and in the Syriac Gospels ܬܪܥܝܬܐ (Peshitta and Lewisian); and 'powerful men'—in the Odes ܓܢܒܪܐ, and in the Syriac Gospels ܐܚܝܕܐ (Peshitta and Lewisian).

It is to be observed that the whole of the language in Luke i. 51, 52 appears to be borrowed from the Song of Hannah in 1 Samuel ii, with occasional colouring from the Psalms: e.g. Psalm lxxxviii (lxxxix), 10. We have also a similar strain of thought in 2 Corinthians x. 5: 'Casting down (ܡܣܬܪܝܢ) imaginations (ܡܚܫܒܬܐ) and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God.' It will be very difficult to establish a direct connexion between the Odes and St. Luke, unless there should be closer linguistic agreement.

As far as the phraseology of the Odes is concerned the most obvious New Testament verses, which might have affected it, may be summarized as follows:

The idea of a babe leaping in the womb is expressed by the same words in all the Syriac versions and the Odes.

ܕܨ ܥܘܠܐ ܒܟܪܣܐ are the words used by the Lewisian and the Peshitta Versions of Luke i. 44, and in Ode xxviii. 2.

The idea that the sword will not separate us from the Lord

is in Romans viii. 35 expressed in words different from those used in Ode xxviii. 4; for whereas the Odes use ܦܠܓ to express 'separate', the Syriac version of Romans exhibits ܦܪܫ, and whereas the Odes use ܣܝܦܐ to express 'sword', the Syriac of Romans has ܚܪܒܐ.

The idea of 'walking' in the Lord is expressed by the verb ܗܠܟ in Ode xxxiii. 13, and Colossians ii. 6.

The idea of a voice reaching its destination is expressed in Luke i. 44, and in Ode xxxvii. 2, by the phrase 'the fall of the voice' (ܢܦܠ ܩܠܐ), the only difference being the use of the particle of the indirect complement. This particle is ܠܘܬ in the Odes and ܒ in the Peshiṭta and Lewis texts.

The idea of Christ having been humbled, and then exalted, is expressed in Philippians ii. 8–9 with the verb ܡܟܟ 'to humble', and ܪܘܡܡ 'to exalt', while in Ode xli. 12 ܐܪܝܡ is used to express 'to exalt'.

The idea expressed by the sentence 'before the foundation of the world' has a different phraseology in the Old and the New Testaments and the Odes. Ode xli. 15 has ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܬܪܡܝܬܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ. This is identical with the Peshiṭta rendering of πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου of the Greek of the New Testament. The Old Syriac versions, both Lewisian and Curetonian, render this Greek expression by the simple word ܡܢ ܩܕܡ (Matt. xiii. 35 = Ps. lxxvii [lxxviii]. 2), which means 'from the beginning'. In Matthew xxv. 35 there is a lacuna in the Old Syriac versions, and we do not know how the Greek phrase was rendered. In John xvii. 24 the Curetonian text is missing, and the Lewis text follows the Greek reading πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and gives us ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܥܠܡܐ 'before the world was'. The same idea is found in Proverbs viii. 23, 29, but it is expressed in a very different manner.

The idea of God not repenting of what He does is in Romans xi. 29; and in Numbers xxiii. 19, and in Ode iv. 11. In Romans it is expressed by the verb ܗܦܟ, in Numbers by ܐܬܗܦܟ, and in the Odes by ܐܬܬܘܝ.

The idea of imploring God to be delivered from the Evil One is in the Lord's Prayer, which was evidently known to every Christian. In all the Syriac versions of Matthew vi. 13 the sentence 'Deliver us from the Evil One' is rendered by the verb ܦܨܝ, but in Ode xiv. 5 it is expressed by the verb ܦܪܩ. The divergence in phraseology is remarkable.

In Ode vii. 23 we have a parallel to the language of 1 Corinthians. The Odist, who is emphasizing the importance of Christian song and praise to God, says:

> 'Let there be nothing without life (ܕܠܐ ܢܦܫܐ)
> Nor without knowledge, nor dumb' (ܘܠܐ ܕܫܬܩ).

With these we compare 1 Corinthians xiv. 7:

τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα,

and 1 Corinthians xiv. 10:

> *τοσαῦτα εἰ τύχοι γένη φωνῶν εἰσιν ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄφωνον,*

of which passage the Peshitta rendering is:

ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܗܘܢ ܢܦܫܐ

and

ܘܠܝܬ ܚܕ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܩܠܐ

where the Ode has ܘܠܐ ܕܫܬܩ instead of ܕܠܐ ܩܠܐ. Here again we note the independence of the Odist as compared with the Peshiṭta.

In Ode vi. 6 we have an interesting parallel in the language of 1 Corinthians ii. 12. The passage in the Ode expresses the desire of God

> 'That those things should be known which by His grace have been given to us.'

This is nearer to the Greek of Corinthians,

ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν

('that we may know the things that are *freely given* us of God')

than to the Peshiṭta rendering:

ܕܢܕܥ ܡܘܗܒܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܝܗܒ ܠܢ܀

Digitized by Google

Thus either the passage in Corinthians is borrowed from the Odes, or the Odes have made use of the text of Corinthians, and have given us the borrowed passage in an earlier and more exact translation than we have in the Peshiṭta, where the *graciousness* of the gift (χαρισθέντα) is not so clearly stated.

In Ode xxxviii. 16–21 we have a sequence which is closely parallel to the argument in 1 Corinthians iii where Paul explains that, although he had planted and Apollos watered, they were really only under-workers with God, so that the planting was really God's. And he says the same thing when he turns to a parallel figure of the building of a house, that, although he might have laid the foundations, God was really the builder. All of this is taken up by the Odist, who refers the laying of foundations and the planting of the field to the Lord, with the watering and the husbandry of the same, and with the remark that the Lord *alone* is to be glorified.

These coincidences are so minute and so varied that we can hardly believe the Ode to be independent of the Epistle. The Odist has made the Pauline position more clear by leaving Paul out entirely.

In Ode xiv. 10 the Odist concludes with the sentiment that 'God is able for all our needs', which is nearly parallel to Philemon iv. 20, 'My God shall supply every need of yours'. 'Need' (χρεία) is in the Ode ܣܘܢܩܢܐ, in the Peshiṭta ܚܫܚܘܬܐ. Further, the Peshiṭta follows the Greek in rendering πληρώσει ('shall fulfil') literally, which the Odist explains in the sense of Divine ability (ܡܨܐ).

In Ode xxxiii. 13 we have noted the coincidence with the Pauline language in Colossians ii. 6, 'walk ye in me' being parallel to 'receive Christ Jesus the Lord and walk in Him'. Thus Wisdom who speaks in the Ode is understood to be Christ, as in other passages, and there is an exact agreement between the Ode and the Greek or the Syriac of Colossians.

In Ode xxviii. 3 we have what may be a case of dependence of the Odist upon the Epistle to the Hebrews (or conversely).

Digitized by Google

It is certainly remarkable that the peculiar expression of the Odist:

'I believed, therefore I rested',

should coincide so closely with the Biblical language:

'We who have believed, do enter into rest.'

CHAPTER XI

POETRY OF THE ODES.

IN the Semitic languages there is a great difference between a poetical style and poetry. In the Hebrew of some books of the Old Testament there is a poetical style of high charm, with a certain cadence and rhythm in the arrangement of phrases created by the use of the well-known parallelism; but poetry, as consisting of short and long vowels, or of an equal number of syllables divided into two stanzas, or, as Arabs and Syrians call them, two 'houses', is utterly missing. The first category of poetry is only parallelistic, and the second is metrical and may be parallelistic as well.

As to the Arabic language, its poetry from the middle of the seventh century onwards is classed with the second category of metrical poetry. Before the seventh century we are not in a position to know how this poetry was constituted. The numerous poetical compositions known as 'early Arabian poetry', and represented chiefly by the well-known *Mufaḍḍalyāt*, *Mu'allaḳāt*. *Ḥamāsah*, and *Jamharah*, are enveloped in a thick mist of prehistoricity and spuriousness, and in the present state of our knowledge we may assert that till fuller light dawns they can hardly stand in the domain of a positive study. Before this metrical poetry showed itself with all its complicated rules there was the *saj'* or rhymed prose of the nomads, in which traces of ancient Hebrew parallelism are numerous and undoubted. But the same parallelism is, generally speaking, absent in the subsequent elaborate development of poetry. The Arabic poetry is, therefore, useless so far as the Odes are concerned.

Digitized by Google

Let us now examine the Syriac poetry. The style which greatly influenced the poetry of the Syrians from the fourth to the twelfth centuries is that of Ephrem. If in abstract and original studies he has found some critics who perhaps not very unjustly lowered his talent far below the rate of his fame, no one has the right to deny that by the multiplicity and the charm of his poetical compositions he has the first place among ecclesiastical poets in general, and certainly so in all the branches of the Syrian Church. The poetry of this Father is metrical and parallelistic; but obviously Ephrem did not invent Syriac poetry. What kind of poetry had the Syrians, then, before Ephrem? We have at our disposal three independent sources from which to draw our knowledge: (1) the *Hymn of the Soul*; (2) poems of Ephrem purporting to imitate those of Bardaisan; (3) genuine quotations from Bardaisan.

The *Hymn of the Soul* has found many editors and translators. It was almost certainly written in the school of Bardaisan by one of his disciples about 180 to 220. It is precarious, however, to assert that Bardaisan himself was its writer, because of the exclusively Syriac colour of its phraseology. Had Bardaisan, who knew and wrote Greek as well as Syriac, written it, he would have left traces of his Greek science in it. The poetry of this Hymn is parallelistic and partly metrical, but the metre is frequently imperfect, owing to the fact that the silent letters of the declension might have been pronounced in some cases at that early time, or possibly owing to a certain corruption of the text by the copyists. As it stands the poem can be reduced to the five, six, and the seven-syllable metre; but in respect of its syllabic rhythm it is far below the metrical perfection which the majority of Ephremic compositions can justly claim.

Ephrem, according to the Roman edition of his works (iii. 87–128), wrote seventeen hymns in imitation of the tune of the Psalms written by Bardaisan, or sung by his disciples. These hymns have generally stanzas of four metrical lines, three of which have twice five syllables, and the last one once seven syllables; but frequently

Digitized by Google

also the order is inverted, and one finds in them lines of nine syllables:

ܒܥܠܡܐ ܚܙܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܒܢܝܢܫܐ (*R. E.*, p. 127)

or of thirteen syllables, which in the last analysis can be reduced to two lines of four syllables, and one of five:

ܘܡܢܐ ܕܡܫܒܚܝܢ ܘܡܩܕܫܝܢ ܠܒܪܐ ܘܣܓܕܝܢ ܘܡܘܕܝܢ ܠܐܒܐ (*ibid.*)

However imperfect the metrical arrangements appear sometimes to be, the parallelism is in all of them obvious and perfect in all its details.

As far as the Psalms which Bardaisan wrote are concerned we are in complete ignorance. If the information of Ephrem has any historical value (and it surely has) his Psalms were 150 in number, apparently in imitation of their proto-type, the Psalms of the King-Prophet. Appropriate to the point which concerns us are the words (ii. 554, *R. E.*):

ܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܡܕܖ̈ܫܐ ܘܥܠܝ ܒܢܥܡ̈ܬܐ ܘܪܟܒ ܙܡܝܖ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܐܥܠ ܡܫܘ̈ܚܬܐ ܒܟܝ̈ܠܐ ܘܡܬܩ̈ܠܐ ܦܠܓ ܡ̈ܠܐ.

> '(Bardaisan) wrote hymns and adapted (them) to airs; he composed *Odes* and introduced rhythms[1] (in them); he divided the words in measures and weights.'

We can infer from these words that Bardaisan's Odes certainly contained rhythm; but it is not clear whether the terms 'measures and weights' refer to the metrical arrangement as we understand it in our days. The critics have generally understood them in this sense, and the tradition of the end of the fifth century affirmed that Ephrem's orthodox hymns were written to counteract the nefarious effect produced by Bardaisan's heterodox psalms. All this is a theme for speculation to amplify.

The only clear quotations from Bardaisan are given by

[1] The word ܡܫܘ̈ܚܬܐ refers probably to a parallelistic poetry, and no metrical arrangement was intended by Ephrem when he used it. Theodore Bar Kewani says that the Psalms of David and the books ascribed to Solomon are written in ܡܫܘ̈ܚܬܐ (*Corp. Script. Christ. Orient.*, vol. lxv, p. 323).

Digitized by Google

Theodore Bar Kewani (seventh century), and have been published by H. Pognon in *Inscriptions Mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir*, 1899, pp. 122–3;[1] these quotations contain five stanzas from a work written by Bardaisan, and are in some passages difficult to understand. Their poetry is parallelistic and rhythmical with an apparently defective metrical arrangement of six, seven, and eight syllables. The last stanza is as follows:

ܐܬܦܨܚ ܐܐܪ ܒܓܘܗ: ܘܗܘܐ ܫܠܝܐ ܘܢܘܚܐ:
ܘܐܫܬܒܚ ܡܪܝܐ ܒܚܟܡܬܗ: ܘܣܠܩܬ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܠܚܢܢܗ.

i. e. 'The air rejoiced in it: And there was quiet and rest, And the Lord was glorified in His wisdom, And thanks mounted to His grace.'

After these preliminaries, the poetry of the Odes may be summarized as follows:

Rhythm and Strophe.

The rhythm proceeds regularly throughout; we give two examples according to the terminology sanctioned by G. B. Gray in his *Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (pp. 132–3).

Example of a *balancing* rhythm:

'And His members are with Him
And on them do I hang and He loves me.'—iii. 2.

Example of an *echoing* rhythm:

'Distil Thy dew upon us
And open Thy rich fountains that pour forth to us milk and honey.'—iv. 10.

Generally two parallelisms constitute a strophe of complete meaning. For example:

'Open ye, open ye your hearts to the exultation of the Lord,
And let your love abound from the heart and even to the lips,
To bring forth fruits to the Lord, a holy life,
And to talk watchfully in His light.—viii. 1, 2.

[1] They have been re-edited by Nau in *Patrologia Syriaca*, ii, p. 517, and by A. Scher in *Corp. Script. Christ. Orient.*, vol. lxvi, p. 308.

Digitized by Google

Frequently, however, one parallelism and a half constitute a strophe:

'My heart was cloven and its flower appeared,
And grace sprang up in it,
And it brought forth fruit to the Lord.'

Metre.

Strictly speaking, no regular metrical measures are found in the Odes. However, by scanning carefully the lines many half-strophes fall into seven-syllabled metre, the most used in Syriac literature; next come the fifth, sixth, and fourth-syllable metres:

ܘܗܕ̈ܡܘܗܝ ܠܘܬܗ ܐܢܘܢ: ܘܒܗܘܢ ܬܠܐ ܐܢܐ ܘܡܚܒ ܠܝ.

(seven syllables) *Ode* iii. 2.

ܘܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܛܝܢ ܠܗ: ܡܗܦܟܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܪ̈ܫܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܡܥܪܩܠܝܢ ܫܒ̈ܝܠܝܗܘܢ: ܘܡܚܪܒܝܢ ܡܥܒܪ̈ܬܗܘܢ.

(six syllables) *Ode* xxxix. 1, 2.

ܘܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܐܝܟ ܐܒܝܕܐ: ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ.
ܘܫܘܠܛܢܝ ܐܝܟ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ:

(five syllables) *Ode* xxviii. 11.

ܦܬܚܘ ܐܕ̈ܢܝܟܘܢ: ܘܐܡܠܠ ܠܟܘܢ:
ܗܒܘ ܠܝ ܢܦܫܟܘܢ.

(four syllables) *Ode* ix. 1, 2.

A combination of this syllabic arrangement gives even lines of 8, 9, 10, 12 syllables; but the arrangement being so unsteady and somewhat superficial, it has not been found necessary to follow it in our numbering either of the verses of the text or of those of the translation.

Parallelism.

The Aramaeo-Hebraic parallelism is represented in the Odes from beginning to end with all its subdivisions. We give an example of complete and another of incomplete parallelism.

Complete:

'The work of His hands
And the fabric of His fingers;
The multitude of His mercies
And the strength of His word.'—xvi. 6, 7.

Incomplete:

'I have been united
For the lover has found the beloved.'—iii. 7.

The numbers of the verses of the Odes have been adapted to parallelism. This adaptation, as in the case with the canonical Psalter and some prophetic books, can sometimes be amplified by subdivision of the text so that one parallelism should contain two verses instead of one; the examples just quoted can serve as an illustration:

'1. I have been united
for the lover has found the beloved,
2. In order that I may love Him that is the Son
I shall become a son.'

In many cases we have assigned one number which we have, however, divided into two by means of letters 1 a, 1 b. This might have been done for some other cases, but in occurrences of this kind there is a great deal of variety in the possible arrangement, so that here, too, the best thing to do is to leave the matter to every one's own judgement.

Parallelism is not always a good guarantee for the right translation of a verse; for example:

'And let our faces shine in His light
And let our hearts meditate in His love
By night and by day
Let us exult with the joy of the Lord.'—xli. 6, 7.

It is evident that we ought to join the sentence 'By night and by day' to the preceding member; for the Odist is imitating the first canonical Psalm (Ps. i. 2); but the poetical parallelism

Digitized by Google

contradicts that of the MS., and requires that the same sentence should be attached to the following member:

'By night and by day
Let us exult with the joy of the Lord.'

In many other places the sense was not so obvious; in such cases, we have followed the indications of the MS., leaving the ultimate question of division of the verses to be decided by every one's own taste. For example:

'And His cleaving (of my heart) became my salvation,
And I ran in the way, in His peace,
In the way of truth.
From beginning and even to the end
I acquired His knowledge,
And I was established upon the rock of truth.'—xi. 3, 4.

It is obvious that one may refer the sentence 'From beginning and even to the end' to the first member, as meaning, 'I ran in the way of truth from beginning and even to the end'; and one may refer it equally well to the following member as meaning 'From beginning and even to the end I acquired His knowledge'. In such cases it was safer to follow the MS. and leave speculations aside.

We conclude this short study by remarking that the poetical style, or the poetry, of the Odes is more Hebraic and Bardesanian and more early Syriac than Ephremic, or later Syriac; and, with some reserve for our ignorance of early Syriac poetry, we would venture to add that it is more Hebraic than early Syriac, except in supposing (and this might probably have been the case) that the early Syriac poetry was modelled on that of the Hebrew of the Old Testament.

Another question dealing with the Odes will not be out of place here. Since they are undoubtedly written in poetical style, and are devotional hymns, have they ever been used in the churches? To this question we can only give a very imperfect

Digitized by Google

answer, owing to the fact that the books containing the breviaries of the Syrian Churches which we were able to read were printed for the use of those Syrians who are in communion with the Church of Rome. Generally the printing of these books is undertaken by the Roman congregation *De Propaganda Fide*, and the editors carefully expunge from them everything that is not in accordance with the doctrine of Rome and its canon of the Biblė; such is the case with the *Breviarium Chaldaicum* of the Eastern Syrian Church (1886–7, Paris, vols. i, ii, iii), and the *Breviarium iuxta ritum eccles. antioch. Syrorum* of the Western Syrian Church (1886–98, Mosul, vols. i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi, vii). For purposes of comparison we have read the first publication and the first three volumes of the second, and we have not found any use of the Solomonic Odes in them.

Our knowledge is, therefore, reduced to our two MSS. From the indications of H it appears that the text was sung in the churches, or in some devotional meetings, of the Western Syrians. Syrians in general have the habit of dividing a verse of the canonical Psalms into two, and of inserting a Hallelujah between the two parts. The English reader would have an idea of this process if in all half-verses of the second Psalm he were to read: 'Why do the heathen rage, *Hallelujah*, and the people imagine a vain thing. The Kings of the earth set themselves, *Hallelujah* . . .,' &c. The Western Syrians have every day such Psalms sung in public with a special tune, the one used in the evenings being invariably the 91st. Coming to the Odes, the facsimiles will show that in the first part of them the verses have the letter ܗ, sign of *Hallelujah*, inserted between the first and the second member, and this is an unmistakable mark that these same verses were sung in an ecclesiastical gathering, or, more probably, in the churches. It is necessary, however, to point out that the letter ܗ of Hallelujah is only exhibited in Odes iii–xxviii, and is missing in Odes xxviii–xlii.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XII

UNITY OF THE ODES.

AS Kittel has rightly pointed out, a composition transmitted to posterity as a literary unity is to be so considered until the contrary is established beyond doubt. The first serious attempt to challenge the unity of the Odes has been made by Harnack, who, believing them to be a Jewish production, found himself bound to declare all the obviously Christian passages which they contain to be mere interpolations. An attentive perusal of the Odes makes it probable, however, that, generally speaking, all of them emanate from a single source. This can be proved by the contents of the Odes and by their form.

1. *Contents of the Odes.*

The concordance to the text of the Odes placed at the end of this volume will be useful for our investigations. It will be found that in general the theme developed by the Odist is one throughout. The most striking features in the whole collection may be summarized as follows:

Love. Ode iii. 2–5: 'And (His?) members are with Him, and on them do I hang, and He loves me. For I should not have known how to love the Lord, if He had not loved me. For who is able to distinguish love, except one that is loved? I love the Beloved, and my soul loves Him, and where His rest is, there also am I.' See further vi. 2; vii. 19; viii. 1, 13; xi. 2; xii. 12; xiv. 6; xvi. 2, 3; xvii. 12; xviii. 1; xxiii. 3; xl. 4; xli. 2, 6; xlii. 7, 9. Besides, the verb meaning 'to love' is used five times, and the adjective 'beloved' three times.

Knowledge. Ode vi. 6: 'The Lord has multiplied His knowledge, and is zealous that those things should be known which by His grace have been given to us.' See further vii. 7, 13, 21; viii. 8, 12; xi. 4; xii. 3; xv. 5; xvii. 12; xxiii. 4; xxxiv. 5. Besides, the verb meaning 'to know' is expressed forty-five times.

Ignorance is expressed in vii. 21, 23; xi. 8; xviii. 11; xxviii. 13.

Faith. Ode iv. 5: 'For one hour of thy faith is more precious

Digitized by Google

than all days and years.' See further viii. 11; xvi. 4; xxii. 7; xxviii. 3; xxix. 6; xxxiv. 6; xxxix. 5, 13; xli. 1; xlii. 9, 19.

Truth. Ode viii. 8: 'Hear the Word of Truth and receive the knowledge of the Most High.' See further ix. 8; xi. 3, 5; xii. 1, 2, 12, 13; xiv. 7; xv. 4; xvii. 5, 7; xviii. 6, 15; xx. 9; xxiii. 18; xxiv. 10, 12; xxv. 10; xxxi. 2; xxxii. 2; xxxiii. 8; xxxviii. 1, 4, 7, 10, 15; xxxix. 10; xli. 1, 9, 15, 16.

Error. Ode xv. 6: 'The way of error I have left and I went towards Him.' See further xviii. 10, 14; xxxi. 2; xxxviii. 6, 8, 10. For the use of the verb meaning 'to err' see xvii. 5; xxxi. 2; xxxviii. 4, 5, 11.

Glorification or Praise. Ode vi. 7: 'And His praise He gave us for His name.' See further x. 4; xi. 17; xii. 4; xiii. 2; xiv. 5; xvi. 1, 2, 5, 20; xvii. 16; xviii. 16; xx. 9; xxi. 9; xxvi. 1, 5; xxix. 2, 11; xxxi. 3; xxxvi. 2; xl. 2; xli. 4, 16. Besides, the verb meaning to 'glorify', to 'praise', is used twelve times.

Rest. Ode iii. 5: 'And where His rest is, there also am I.' See further xi. 12; xiv. 6; xx. 8; xxv. 12; xxvi. 3, 10, 12; xxviii. 3; xxx. 2, 7; xxxv. 6; xxxvi. 1; xxxvii. 4.

Grace. Ode iv. 6: 'For who is there that shall put on Thy grace and be injured?' See further v. 3; vi. 6; vii. 22, 25; ix. 5; xi. 1; xv. 8; xx. 7; xxiii. 2, 4; xxiv. 13; xxv. 4; xxix. 2, 5; xxxi. 3, 7; xxxiii. 1, 10; xxxiv. 6; xxxvii. 4; xli. 3.

Light. Ode vii. 14: 'And He set over it the trace of His light.' See further v. 6; vi. 17; viii. 2; x. 1, 6; xi. 11, 19; xii. 3, 7; xv. 2; xvi. 15; xxi. 3, 6; xxv. 7; xxix. 7; xxxii. 1; xxxviii. 1; xli. 6, 14.

Darkness. Ode xi. 19: 'And they grow in the growth of thy trees, and they change from darkness to light.' See further v. 5; xv. 2; xvi. 15, 16; xviii. 6; xxi. 3; xxxi. 1; xlii. 16.

Thought. Ode ix. 3: 'The word of the Lord and His good pleasures, the holy thought that He has thought concerning His Messiah.' See further ix. 4–5; xii. 4, 7; xv. 5; xvi. 8, 9, 19; xvii. 5; xviii. 14; xx. 2, 3; xxi. 5; xxiii. 5, 19; xxiv. 7; xxviii. 19; xxxiv. 2; xxxviii. 21; xli. 10.

Digitized by Google

Mark, Trace, Seal. Ode iv. 7: 'For Thy seal is known and Thy creatures are known by it.' See further vii. 14; x. 6; xxiii. 8, 9, 12; xxvii. 2; xxix. 7; xxxix. 7, 10, 11; xlii. 1.

Way. Ode vii. 13: 'For it is to Knowledge He hath appointed His way.' See further iii. 10; xi. 3; xii. 6; xvii. 8; xxii. 7, 11; xxiii. 15; xxiv. 13; xxxiii. 8, 13; xxxiv. 1; xxxviii. 7; xxxix. 7, 13; xli. 11; xlii. 2.

Righteousness and Justification. Ode viii. 5: 'Ye who were despised be lifted up, now that your righteousness has been lifted up.' See further viii. 21; ix. 10; xvii. 2; xx. 4; xxv. 10, 12; xxix. 5; xxxi. 5; xxxvi. 7; xli. 12.

Corruption and Incorruption. Ode viii. 23: 'And ye shall be found incorrupt in all ages to the name of your Father.' See further vii. 11; ix. 4; xi. 12; xv. 8; xvii. 2; xxi. 5; xxii. 11; xxviii. 5; xxxiii. 1, 7, 12; xxxviii. 9; xl. 6. Besides, the verb meaning 'to corrupt' is used fifteen times.

Life. Ode ix. 4: 'For in the will of the Lord is your life, and His thought is everlasting life.' See further iii. 9; vi. 18; viii. 2; x. 2, 6; xv. 10; xxii. 10; xxiv. 8; xxvi. 9; xxviii 6; xxxi. 7; xxxviii. 3; xl. 6; xli. 3; xlii. 14. Besides, the verb meaning 'to live' is used seven times, and the adjective meaning 'living' eight times.

Salvation. Ode v. 11: 'And because the Lord is my salvation I will not fear.' See further vii. 16; xi. 3; xv. 6; xvii. 2; xviii. 7; xix. 11; xxi. 2; xxv. 2; xxviii. 2; xxxi. 13; xxxiv. 4; xxxv. 2; xxxviii. 3; xl. 5. Besides, the verb meaning 'to save' is used seventeen times.

Word. Ode. x. 1: 'The Lord hath directed my mouth by His Word.' See further vii. 7; viii. 8; ix. 3; xii. 3, 5, 8, 10, 12; xv. 9; xvi. 7, 8, 14, 19; xviii. 4; xxiv. 9; xxix. 9, 10; xxxii. 2; xxxvii. 3; xxxix. 9; xli. 11, 14; xlii. 14.

Face. Ode xi. 14: 'My eyes were enlightened and my face received the dew.' See further viii. 14; xiii. 2, 3; xv. 2, 9; xvii. 4; xxi. 6, 9; xxii. 11; xxv. 4; xxxi. 5; xxxvi. 3; xl. 4; xli. 6; xlii. 13.

Digitized by Google

Right-hand. Ode xix. 5: 'And gave the mixture to the world without their knowing, and those who take it are in the fullness of the right hand.' See further viii. 6, 20; xiv. 4; xviii. 7; xxii. 7; xxv. 2, 7, 9; xxviii. 15; xxxviii. 20.

Some less general but more characteristic topics of the Odes are the following:

1. Allusions are made to a mystical crown in Odes i. 1; v. 12; ix. 8, 9, 11; xvii. 1; xx. 7.

2. Four passages mention a harp, generally the Lord's harp on which the believer wants to play. Odes vi. 1; vii. 17; xiv. 8; xxvi. 3.

3. The idea of God being the helper of man is expressed in vii. 3; viii. 6; xxi. 2, 5; xxii. 6; xxv. 2, 6; xxvi. 13.

4. The idea of experiencing an effect on the face, or of acquiring a new face, is expressed in xvii. 4; xxi. 9; xl. 4; xli. 6. See for further references the above heading, *Face*.

5. The offering to God of the fruit of the lips (Heb. xiii. 15) is mentioned in viii. 1–2; xii. 2; xvi. 2; xx. 4; xxxvii. 2–3; xl. 2.

6. The figure of the milk from the breasts of God is emphasized in viii. 16; xiv. 2; xix. 2–3; xxxv. 4–6; xl. 1.

7. The joy felt by good people is found in vii. 1–2, 17; xv. 1; xxiii. 1; xxxi. 3, 6; xxxii. 1.

8. The peace in which true believers live is mentioned in viii. 7; ix. 6; x. 2; xi. 3; xxxv. 1; xxxvi. 8.

9. The general idea of fruits of God or man is expressed in iv. 4; vii. 1; viii. 2; xi. 1; xiv. 6–7; xvii. 13; xxxvii. 3.

10. For putting on of Christ, His grace, His light, &c., see iv. 6, 8; vii. 4; xiii. 3; xv. 8; xx. 7; xxi. 3; xxiii. 1, 3; xxxiii. 12; xxxix. 8.

11. On the rescue from bonds affected by Christ by His descent into Hades or otherwise, see x. 2–5; xv. 9; xvii. 8–16; xxi. 2, 4; xxii. 8–9; xxv. 1, 3–4, 9, 11–12; xlii. 11–20.

12. The idea of God being our hope is in v. 2, 10; xxix. 1; xl. 1.

From the foregoing quotations and references it seems to us

Digitized by Google

probable that the Odes are derived from one source. The characteristic features which form their essence link them, indeed, to one another so closely that it is very difficult not to ascribe the whole collection to a single man, or, at all events, to a single school of thought. This unity of thought had evidently been noticed by Harnack himself, for he writes 'Nimmt man sie in der Gestalt, in der sie uns vorliegen, als eine einheitliche und originale Sammlung'.

2. *Form of the Odes.*

If we examine the form in which the Odes have come down to us it will appear that as their main thoughts and theological expressions are one, the thread of their narrative is also unmistakably one. The following considerations will render this view probable:

(*a*) In all the above features the Syriac words used are identical. In case of the Odes being a translation from another language it goes to the credit of the Syrian translator that so little change in the lexicological form of the narrative is noticeable in his work. Two instances only to the contrary are somewhat striking; the first is the employment of the verbs ܐܚܒ and ܪܚܡ in the sense of 'to love'. Lexicographically speaking, the former conveys more the sense of 'love' than the latter, which naturally means to 'unite in friendship, to befriend, to pity'. This etymological sense is, however, not followed by Syrian writers, with whom both verbs have acquired an almost identical meaning, although in their derived nouns of action the etymological distinction is frequently preserved. The second example is the alternate use of ܡܠܬܐ and ܦܬܓܡܐ to express 'Word' or 'word', cf. p. 92. Some other instances may be mentioned here, such as ܡܚܫܒܬܐ and ܬܪܥܝܬܐ 'thought', 'intention', ܢܝܚܐ and ܢܝܚܘܬܐ 'rest', ܙܡܝܪܬܐ and ܡܙܡܘܪܐ 'ode, psalm', &c. But since the exact meaning conveyed through them by the first author is not clear, the determination of their linguistic meaning would require useless lexicographical subtleties on which much should not be built.

Digitized by Google

(*b*) Some Odes are united to one another by the same process of introducing the subject. So Odes viii, ix, x, and xiii begin with the imperative 'open ye'. Odes iii, vii, viii, xiii, xxxiv end with an exhortation to the believers or singers, and Odes xi, xvi, xvii, xviii, xx, xli with a doxological formula. The beginning of Odes vi, xiv, xv, xvi, xxviii have an identical way of expressing a comparison.

CHAPTER XIII

Syriac or Greek?

We come now to one of the most difficult parts of our inquiry, the determination of the original language in which the Odes were composed. We shall assume them to be Christian, for all objections on this side are either superficial and need not be regarded, or they are such as are evanescent as soon as we succeed in getting at the meaning of the author. No one who has spent any time on the study of the book would lay any stress on the fact that the name of Jesus does not appear in its pages, for it is clear that the author has a distinct Christology, not very different from that of the Nicene theology, and employs most of the terms and figures in which the early Christians expressed their doctrine of the Divine nature. His Christ is the Christian's Christ, with an Incarnation in terms more pronounced, in some respects, than the New Testament itself.

In many of the Odes, Christ is Himself the speaker, for whom the Odist artificially moves on one side, after a slight overture, and who is the subject of the final doxology with which the Ode concludes, at least in certain cases.

Consequently our problem reduces to this: we have a Christian book of hymns written in or on the borders of the first century, and we have to decide whether of two forms to which we trace it in early times (the Greek or the Syriac), either can be regarded as the origin of the other. Did the Odist write in Syriac? and

Digitized by Google

did someone render him into Greek? Or was it the converse? Is it possible that the author was responsible for the issue of his n a bilingual form? For we have great bilingual scholars like Bardaisan capable of writing such Odes, and we have great bilingual Churches like Antioch capable of singing them. We shall try in the present chapter to clear up the relation between the Greek and the Syriac. If any further hypothesis should be necessary, such as the existence of another Semitic speech behind the Greek and Syriac, we can resort to it, but certainly not before it is necessary; for the antiquity of both Greek and Syriac forms of the Odes is now well attested.

One of the first things which the student of the Odes will gather from the translations which are offered in the present volume is the unusual amount of Semitism in the language of the Odes. There is a constant recurrence of paronomasia, to which we have drawn attention elsewhere, which at first sight, at all events, appears to be Semitic paronomasia; such cases as:

'I was *truthed* on the rock of *truth*.'—*Ode* xi.

'I was *covered* with the *covering* of thy Spirit.'—*Ode* xxv.

'*Blessing* He *blessed me*.'—*Ode* xxviii.

'My heart *gushes* out a *gush*.'—*Ode* xxxvi.

and the like.

Besides these Semitic idioms and assonances there are instances of Semitic word-play which at first sight seem inexplicable except in the Syriac language. It was not surprising that the 'midwife' passage in Ode xix should have been claimed by Mingana as a decisive Syriacism, since such language as

'She had not sought a midwife (ܚܝܬܐ),
For He was midwife to her (ܐܚܝܗ̇),'

does not appear, at first sight, to be possible except in Syriac, for in what other language would it be possible to produce or

Digitized by Google

reproduce the word-play? Thus we find ourselves face to face with a row of decided Semitisms, such as would not normally occur in translation, and the first suggestion is to conclude that the Syriac Odes have precedence over the Greek Odes.

The same suggestion comes up when we explore into the Greek Odes which underlie the Coptic tradition. Cases occur in which the Syriac appears to be the better text than the Copto-Greek text, and perhaps to be responsible for it. Here is an extremely suggestive instance. The opening of the fifth Ode is in Syriac:

ܡܘܕܐ ܐܢܐ ܠܟ ܡܪܝܐ

of which the natural translation is:

'I will give thanks to thee, O Lord.'

The Coptic equivalent to this has caused hesitation to translators, who have wavered between

'Gratias tibi agam, domine;'

and

'Manifestabo tibi, domine;'

and it is not surprising that the second translation, which is a literal rendering of the Coptic, should be regarded as a misunderstanding of the Syriac, through the substitution of ܡܘܕܥܢܐ for the almost equivalent ܡܘܕܝܢܐ. If such a substitution could be justified, and if parallel cases of misreading or misunderstanding could be found, the Syriac would move into the place of honour.

These, then, are some of the directions in which a careful study of the related texts is necessary. Even a late Syriac text like ours would acquire predominance if it furnished explanation of variants or readings in Greek or Coptic, and if it was intelligible where the Greek was, relatively to itself, obscure; and in our case the Syriac is no longer to be regarded as late, for its antiquity is established. The MSS. may be modern, but the text is that of Ephrem, and, perhaps, of Bardaisan.

On the other hand, we shall have to walk warily, if we are

Digitized by Google

to reach the true solution. For example, in the sporadic instances already cited, no conclusion is to be drawn from the expression in Ode xxviii:

ܡܒܪܟܘ ܒܪܟܢܝ

'He has richly blessed me;'

for this is a reproduction of Genesis xxii. 17, where the LXX is *εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε*, and may just as well be a reproduction of a Greek text as an original Semitism of the Odist.

In the same way the instance of misunderstood Syriac in the opening verse of Ode v disappears upon closer examination. The case is exactly the same as that in which *Pistis Sophia* quotes the 107th Psalm, where the German translators have again given us:

'Manifestate Domino, quod (*l.* quia) est *χρηστός*:'

it is, however, the regular translation of the LXX:

ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ Κυρίῳ ὅτι χρηστός κτέ.

and should have been translated:

'Gratias agite Domino,' &c.

We were, then, correct in explaining the Syriac word as *ἐξομολογήσομαι*, but wrong in suggesting 'manifestabo' as a translation of the parallel Coptic. With the translation corrected the supposed Syriac variant disappears. It was a mere blunder of the first German translators in the use of the Coptic dictionary.

The 'midwife' passage is not so easy to clear up. Here the paronomasia in the Syriac is very pronounced, and the challenge to produce a similar one in Greek is very resonant. We may find the key, perhaps, in Eusebius, who has used the Greek Odes in this very passage, and who speaks of God the Father as *μαιούμενος*. This suggests a Greek rendering:

οὐκ ἐζήτησε μαῖαν·
ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐμαιώσατο αὐτήν.

and when we write it down in that form we see another possible

Digitized by Google

word-play involved in the text; for the word μαιδομαι, 'to bring to bed', has another word, so closely related to it as hardly to be distinguished from it, viz. μαίομαι, 'to seek'. We must, therefore, replace ἐζήτησε by ἐμαίετο (or some nearly coincident form): we may then restore as follows:

οὐκ ἐπεμαίετο μαῖαν·
ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐμαιώσατο αὐτήν.

The paronomasia would then be double in Greek; and the Syriac would have cleverly retained one half of it.

These considerations will show how careful one needs to be in avoiding hasty or premature solutions of the problem.

It may perhaps be thought that this attempt to reconstruct the lost Greek of the sentence in the Ode which describes the miraculous birth has the inherent weakness of conjectural restoration and of over-subtlety. The following consideration will operate in support of the theory of an original Greek at this point. The Syriac sentence is certainly an exposition of the verse in the 22nd Psalm to which allusion has been made above; but this verse is not extant in the Peshiṭta version; it is replaced by something quite different. It follows, then, that unless we assume the Peshiṭta version as we possess it to have varied from its original type, the verse in the Psalm cannot have been expounded in the Syriac, but only from the Greek, or (in the last resort for possible sources) from the Hebrew.

This makes it possible that we have restored the Greek with some measure of correctness, and that the Greek is the original rather than the Syriac.

On the other hand, the sentence which is wanting in the Peshiṭta is extant in the Targum, and we must reserve the possibility that the Odist was acquainted with the Targum. For such an acquaintance might exactly reverse the argument, and reduce to zero the value of our Greek speculation. Mingana's argument for Aramaism would hold the field.

Digitized by Google

Now let us see whether there are other directions in which we can pick up clues for the determination of priority. Here is an extremely interesting case at the close of the 25th Ode. In this Ode the sentence, 'I became the Lord's by the name of the Lord', was emended wrongly in the first edition to 'I became admirable by the name of the Lord', on the ground that the former expression was unintelligible. There was no need of such a correction. It means 'I became a Christian by the name of Christ', or 'I became Christ's by becoming a Christian'. We may compare the following passages:

> Just. *Ap.* i, 12: 'Jesus Christ, *from whom* also we have received *the appellation of Christians.*'
>
> Just. *Dial.* 63: 'The Church, which *arose from his name* and *partakes of his name* (for we are all called Christians).'
>
> Just. *Dial.* 96: 'You curse all those who *from Him have become Christians*' (τῶν ἀπ' ἐκείνου γενομένων Χριστιανῶν).
>
> Just. *Dial.* 117: 'All those who *by the Name of Jesus have become Christians.*'
>
> Iren. *Adv. Haer.* iii. 17: '(in Antiochia) pro fide, quam in Christo habebant, vocati sunt Christiani.'

So there seems no doubt as to the meaning of the words 'I became the Lord's by the name of the Lord'. We may set down the following as an equivalent Greek sentence:

> *ἐγενόμην δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ·*

or:

> *ἐγενόμην δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου.*

If this is correct the next sentence, 'I was justified by His gentleness', should stand for:

> ἐδικαιώθην διὰ τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ

with employment of the favourite paronomasia between χρηστός and χριστός, with which we are familiar in Justin Martyr and elsewhere.

Digitized by Google

The transition of thought is exactly the same as in Just. *Ap.* i, 4:

> *Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ εἶναι κατηγορούμεθα· τὸ δὲ χρηστὸν μισεῖσθαι, οὐ δίκαιον*

where there is no need to correct *Χριστιανοί* to *χρηστιανοί*.

That we have rightly restored *χρηστότητος* in the Greek appears by a reference to the Coptic text, where the word has been preserved with a slight modification (ⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲓ̈ⲟ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲟⲥ). The Coptic translator, however, did not know what to make of the previous sentence, which is altogether omitted. The existence of this favourite early-Christian play on words is evidence that the Ode was composed in the Greek language: in the Syriac the allusion disappears, nor is the first clause intelligible.

The correctness of our interpretation may be further seen by the light which it throws upon the New Testament itself. When, for example, Paul tells the Corinthians (iii. 23) that they are Christ's, and that Christ is God's, he means that, being Christians, they are Christ's by the name of Christ, and are in a relation of ownership to or of derivation from Christ, just as Christ is in a relation to God, implying either sonship or dependency. Even more striking is the light which is cast upon a passage in the Gospel of Mark, by this expression of 'becoming the Lord's by the name of the Lord'. In Mark ix. 41 we have the following sequence:

> *ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.*

The difficulty here is to determine what is meant by 'in the name', and also to explain how, at the time involved in the narration, Jesus could speak to his disciples as 'belonging to Christ'. Matthew (x. 42) apparently gets over the difficulty by saying that the name is 'the name of a disciple', and leaves out the clause about Christ's ownership; but this does not explain what is meant by the 'name of a disciple'; is it the same thing

Digitized by Google

as the 'name of a prophet'? Matthew appears to mean something of the kind, to judge from the preceding verse, but he has clearly misunderstood Mark, who either means:

> 'In *my* name, because ye are Christ's,'

or:

> 'In the Christian name, because ye are Christ's.'

The Ode comes to our aid at this point, and shows that the alternatives mean the same thing. We are Christ's because we are Christians. The name is, therefore, the name of the Lord.

The play upon *Christos* and *Chrestos* is a very early one, and probably belongs to the period of the nicknames of the Antiochenes. There is a reflexion of it in the New Testament; cf. Ephesians ii. 7:

ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ 'Ιησοῦ.

Here the paronomasia is easily missed by the modern student: it would be quite otherwise with a Christian of the first or second century, who is always trying to explain to his tormentors why he is *anointed*, and how he is *good*.

For instance, in Tertull. *Apol.* 3, we have:

> 'Nemo retractat, ne ideo *bonus* Caius et *prudens* Lucius, quia *Christianus*' (i. e. χρηστός = bonus *aut* prudens).
>
> *Ad Nationes*, i. 3 'Christianum vero nomen, quantum significatio est, de *unctione* interpretatur: etiam cum corrupte a vobis Chrestiani pronuntiamur . . . . . . sic quoque de *suavitate* vel *bonitate* modulatum est' (i. e. χρηστότης = suavitas *aut* bonitas).

The ultimate origin of these etymologies is, as is generally agreed, to be sought in Antioch.

Such an instance as that which we have been discussing almost implies that the Ode was composed in Greek; for the play upon *Christos* and *Chrestos* is only to be made in that language. When it passes into another language, as in the sentence quoted from Tertullian, it requires the assistance of a commentator to make the

Digitized by Google

argument intelligible. We shall assume then, provisionally, that the Ode in which the writer talked of becoming *the Lord's by the name of the Lord*, and of being justified by His *goodness*, is a Greek composition.

In the foregoing discussion we could readily imagine ourselves back in early times and at Antioch, where believers were called Christians as belonging to Christ, with ironical references to their personal *ointment* or superior *goodness*, according to which they became either Christs, or Chrests because they were Christ's. The believers accepted all these titles and appellations. They even took the title of Christ to themselves personally, and gave the explanation of it in the sense that they had received a Divine Anointing. In consequence of this, we cannot always tell whether the word χριστός in early Christian tradition belongs to the Lord or to His followers; and similar difficulties arise in the Odes upon which we are engaged. In Ode xxxvi. 6 the writer says:

> 'He anointed me from His own perfections:
> And I became one of His neighbours.'

The first edition remarked on this sentence that it 'was almost impossible to determine whether the Psalmist is speaking in his own name, or in that of the Messiah, or whether it is an alternation of one with the other'. Most probably the Odist, as in so many other cases, is speaking in the person of Christ, but the sentence which we have quoted shows that the decision is not an easy one to make. We might have quoted Theophilus of Antioch on the other side, who says: 'We are called Christians because we are anointed with the oil of God' (*ad Autol.* i. 12).

The foregoing argument for interpreting the name as the Christian name, followed by a play upon χριστός and χρηστός, is undoubtedly a very strong one. Let us see whether there is anything that can be said on the other side.

It is possible that the expression

> 'I became the Lord's by the name of the Lord'

Digitized by Google

may be derived from the Old Testament. For instance, in Isaiah xliv. 5 we find the following prediction of the admission of proselytes to the covenant of Israel:

> 'One shall say, *I am the Lord's*; and another shall call himself *by the name of Jacob*; and another shall subscribe with his hand *unto the Lord*, and surname himself *by the name of Israel*.'

We may fairly assume (at all events as a working hypothesis) that this passage underlies the language of the Ode. It is quite in the Odist's manner to say 'by the name of the Lord' instead of 'by the name of Jacob' or 'by the name of Israel'. But then this rules out the LXX as the starting-point of the Odist's thought, for the LXX has

Οὗτος ἐρεῖ, τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰμί·

while on the other hand the Peshitta says exactly:

ܗܢܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܐܢܐ

'This one will say, *I am the Lord's*.'

Thus the Syriac would become the prime authority and not the Greek: the reference to χρηστότης, which certainly stood in the Greek text of the Ode, might be due to the fact that the Odist was bilingual, but would hardly have originated in the Syriac.

We have discoursed at some length on this passage in the Odes on account of its importance. At this stage of the argument we can hardly draw a final conclusion, as the considerations on either side are so strong. We must look to the rest of the Ode to see whether it furnishes further indications of Greek or Syriac origin.

It is interesting to notice, in passing, that the passage in Isaiah was recognized as being the language of a proselyte. The Targum, for instance, says, 'I became one of the God-fearers', which is the regular term for Gentiles who attach themselves to Judaism, and occurs in the New Testament itself. Thus we shall raise the

L 2

Digitized by Google

further question as to what kind of proselyte is speaking, and perhaps revive for further study the theory of Professor Menzies that the Odes are the Hymns of *Jewish Proselytes*. Every stone must be turned, and turned again!

We propose in the next place to try and explain the opening verses of the 38th Psalm, which have been the centre of a good deal of discussion. The Syriac tells us that the Odist

'Went up into the Light of Truth as into a chariot',

and then that the Truth took him and led him, preserved him from rocks and waves (?) and brought him to the haven of salvation. The suggestion was made that the language was that which describes a sea-voyage, and that the writer had embarked on the good ship 'Light of Truth'. Carriages naturally do not require special names, and travelling in a carriage involves more delight than danger, and does not end up in a haven, except by extreme poetical licence. At this point the Syriac lexicons barred the way: they could not supply a sufficiently early instance for the translation of ܡܪܟܒܬܐ (*markaba*) as 'ship'; but the text of the Odes, whether translated or original, is certainly early: so it seemed that the rendering 'chariot' would have to stand. On that supposition it was natural that the word for 'waves' should be read as 'cliffs' or 'valleys': though why 'cliffs' should be a special terror to carriages was not clear. Some persons wished to get rid of the 'haven' which had been misread in the *editio princeps*; but this word is certain: it is guaranteed by manuscript authority, and by the fact that it is a quotation from Psalm cvii. 30. The 42nd Psalm is also in evidence, for it is thence that the language is derived about the leading and guiding of the Truth. In the LXX it runs thus:

ἐξαπόστειλον τὸ φῶς σου καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου·
αὐτά με ὡδήγησαν καὶ ἤγαγόν με.—Ps. xlii (xliii). 3.

Moreover, the Ode here, in the use of the past tense, is nearer

to the language of the LXX than to that of the Hebrew or the Peshiṭta. So we are led to look for some Greek word (such as ὄχημα) by which to explain the Syriac.

The two Psalms quoted must be the key to the understanding of the Ode. It occurs to us to inquire, also, whether this Ode (whatever be its original meaning) may not have been interpreted in later times in a baptismal sense, as indeed Dr. Bernard maintains to have been the meaning of the whole body of the Odes. For instance, it appears to have been so interpreted in the Nestorian ritual, where we find the following sequence:[1]

> 'Save me, O God, by thy name (Ps. liv. 1). In the hidden valleys of the world thou walkest as in the sea, O thou who art unbaptised; hasten to come to the glorious haven of baptism ..... And he led them to the haven where they would be (Ps. cvii. 30): to the covenant of the haven of life we have come: to the glorious resurrection of Christ our Saviour.'

Here we recognize at once the reference to the same Psalm that certainly underlies our 38th Ode. And the rest of the language, with its picturesque confusion between land and sea, reflects closely the Ode itself. In the mind of the composer of the Liturgy, Baptism is the ritual and the Church the haven. We find something similar as far back as Theophilus of Antioch. It is not, however, in the Nestorian ritual only that we find suspicious traces of the 38th Ode. We have already suggested that the difficulty in translating the Syriac, which seems to record the feat of taking a chariot and going to sea, was due to a natural misunderstanding of a Greek word susceptible of two meanings, to which the Syriac translator has given the more common meaning. What is remarkable is that Cyril of Jerusalem is, perhaps, guilty of the same misunderstanding, because he did not realize that the usage was poetical. He calls baptism the 'chariot to heaven'; and the expression is so peculiar that we naturally connect it with the opening sentences of the 38th Ode. What then is the term which

[1] *Nestorian Ritual*, ed. Conybeare and Maclean, p. 335.

Digitized by Google

Cyril uses? If we look at his introductory lecture, from which Dr. Bernard drew his striking baptismal analogies, we shall find him describing baptism as

> *ἔνδυμα φωτεινόν· σφραγὶς ἁγία ἀκατάλυτος· ὄχημα πρὸς οὐρανόν· παραδείσου τρυφή.*

All of these expressions are borrowed from or illustrated by the Odes; and the *ὄχημα* is the 'chariot' of Ode xxxviii. Only it ought not to have been rendered 'chariot' (for the word may be rendered 'ship') except on the assumption that Cyril misunderstood it. If he did misunderstand it there is no need why we should follow him: there is, however, the residual possibility that his translators are at fault (including J. H. Newman). Every one did not misunderstand the language. For instance, in the *Coptic Book of the Resurrection of Christ by Bartholomew the Apostle*,[1] we find the following language used by the Apostle Thomas:

> 'Behold! Jesus Christ *set me on board the ship* of Salvation, and *brought me into the haven* of peace.'[2]

The advantage of the new interpretation is that it rids us of the difficulty which Syriac students had felt in attaching the meaning 'ship' to the Syriac word. We get rid also of the confusion in the language of the Ode, where the terrors of travels in a coach are described in terms of rocks and waves. We have no need of emendation of the translation of the text in order to get rid of the 'waves'. The 'haven' for the chariot is no longer a matter of allegory; and, most important of all, we see that the Greek is the original which has been the subject of misunderstanding.

We referred above to the possibility that Theophilus of Antioch was also acquainted with the good ship 'Light of Truth'. On this point we note as follows: The first thing that would occur to a thoughtful person on reading the Ode would be that

[1] Loc. cit., p. 211.

[2] The ordinary Sahidic word for 'ship' is employed, and there is no Greek transliteration to assist us.

Digitized by Google

the Truth stands for the ship as well as for the shipmaster. The 'Light of Truth' is the name of the ship, the 'Light' and the 'Truth' of the 42nd Psalm correspond to the 'Truth' in the Ode which has charge and direction of the passengers in the ship; thus the ship and the shipmaster appear, as far as nomenclature goes, to be interchangeable. The peculiarity appears to have struck Theophilus of Antioch; in presenting an argument for the necessity of Faith he tells Autolycus that one cannot cross the sea unless he first trust himself to *the ship and the shipmaster*:

> *τίς δύναται διαπεράσαι τὴν θάλασσαν ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον ἑαυτὸν πιστεύσῃ τῷ πλοίῳ καὶ τῷ κυβερνήτῃ*;—*ad Autolycum*, i. 8.

The conjunction of ideas may have been suggested by the terms of a familiar hymn: to go on board was an act of faith.

Theophilus is, perhaps, under the influence of the same opening verses of the 38th Ode at a somewhat later point, where he explains how advantageous to the storm-tossed voyager are those islands which have *havens* in which they may take refuge, and how they are guided to these havens and anchorages by the *Word of Truth*. And he explains that the havens are to be understood mystically as being Christian congregations, that is, holy Churches. The whole passage is inspired by the Ode, and is, like the Ode, a parable of Truth and Error. We will transcribe the passage, and underline the expressions which are especially reminiscent of the Ode:

> 'Just as in the sea there are islands inhabited, well-watered and fruitful, having anchorages and *harbours*, so that the storm-tossed mariners may find refuge in them: so God has given to the world, wave-driven and storm-tost by sins, assemblies (I mean holy Churches) in which, *as in havens* with good anchorage, there are to be found the teachings *of the Truth*, to which those who wish to be saved flee for refuge, *having become lovers of the Truth*, and desirous to escape the wrath and judgement of God. And just as there are other islands, rocky and waterless and barren and beast-ridden and uninhabited, to the hurt of the mariners and the storm-tost,

Digitized by Google

where ships are broken and those who go on board of them perish, so is it with the teachings of the Error (I mean heresies) which utterly destroy them who meddle with them. For such persons *are not led by the word of Truth*, but like pirates, when they have filled their ships, run them on the aforesaid places, with the object of utterly destroying them, so does it happen with those that *wander from the Truth*, and are utterly ruined by *the Error*.'—Theoph. *ad Autol.* ii. 14.

The motive of the foregoing allegory is to be sought in the first chapter of Genesis, where the *Synagogē*, or gathering together of the waters, is described, and where the dry land appears. This leads to the describing of the islands of the sea, as above, and to the mystical explanation of the 'Congregation of the Waters'. Theophilus found these explanations a convenient starting-point for the description of Truth and Error, of which one guides to the haven and the other runs on the rocks. He makes his parable, as we have said, in terms that are reminiscent of the 38th Ode of Solomon.

It appears, then, that there are at least three distinct traces of the influence of this 38th Ode on his mind: for besides this parable of Truth and Error, there is the description of heresy as deadly poison mixed with wine, and the joint faith in the Truth as the ship and the shipmaster. It is, however, quite likely that this argument for a Greek original, and the interpretation attached to it, are too subtle to carry conviction. To begin with, although *ὄχημα* is a poetical term for a ship, it is not the natural one: and if the word is somewhat strained, the interpretation is even more so. The main difficulty lies in the use of the word 'haven', which appears to be out of place in overland travel. That such overland travel, however, is contemplated, appears to be involved in the subsequent language of the Ode, where the Truth (ver. 7) takes the traveller on the right road. This is not nautical language. We leave the discussion with a margin of uncertainty.

Now let us turn to another point in which the study of the doctrine of the Odes throws light upon the language in which that

Digitized by Google

doctrine s expressed. We have shown elsewhere that the writer has a Christology which contains the germs from which the Nicene Creed was evolved. For instance, there is the doctrine of the pre-existent Wisdom of God, co-eternal with the Father and identified with the Son. The proof-text for this doctrine, from which all the later theological developments take their rise, is Proverbs viii. 22 ff., where Wisdom says:

'The Lord possessed me in the beginning':

or according to the LXX:

'The Lord created me the beginning':

These words with their context were transferred at an early date in the first century from the Wisdom of God to Christ as the Wisdom of God; and it is to be noticed that both the Hebrew and the LXX forms are involved in the Christology of the Odes.

Thus in Ode xli. 9, apparently *ex ore Christi*:

'The Father of Truth remembered me;
He who possessed me from the beginning.'

and in Ode vii. 8, in an impersonal manner, God is said to have '*created* Wisdom', which involves the reading ἔκτισέ με. As we have pointed out, the Church teachers used almost exclusively the LXX rendering, and got into difficulties thereby; and did not recognize, as far as we know, before the time of Eusebius, that the Hebrew text had another sense than the LXX. These passages suffice to show that we are in a region of thought where Christ has been recognized as the Wisdom of God. So we may proceed to inquire into the use, if any, which the Odes make of the language in which Wisdom is described (and Christ by implication) in the Old Testament. This we have done in another chapter, and we only repeat some of the matter in order to prepare the way for the question as to whether the particular title ἀπόρροια is found in the Odes.

Digitized by Google

The statement of the case for ἀπόρροια is as follows:

(i) It is an undoubted title of Wisdom in *Sap. Sol.* vii. 25, where Wisdom is said to be 'a pure *effluence* from the glory of the Almighty'.

(ii) It was applied to Christ as being the Wisdom of God; as Origen says in his commentary on Romans:

> 'Ipsius unius Paterni fontis (sicut Sapientia dicit) purissima est *manatio* Filius.

Here the Son is defined in Sapiential language as the ἀπόρροια of the Father.'

(iii) It appears, however, that a good while before Origen's time the title had been transferred to the Holy Spirit, as indeed Origen was aware, for he goes on to say that the term 'Wisdom of God', may be also applied to the Holy Spirit:

> 'Hoc idem autem Sapientia Dei etiam de Spiritu Sancto intelligi debet, ubi dicit: Spiritus Domini,' &c.—*Sap. Sol.* i. 7.

We can see the change already made in the following passage from Athenagoras:

> 'The prophetic spirit also is in concord with our argument, for it says, "The Lord created me the beginning of His ways, for His works". Yea, and the very Spirit that was operating in those who made prophetic utterances we affirm to be an effluence (ἀπόρροια) of God, flowing forth (ἀπορρέον) and reflected back again like a ray of the sun.' [1]

Thus Athenagoras first finds Christ in the Wisdom doctrine of Proverbs, and then finds the Holy Spirit in the same Wisdom as described in the Wisdom of Solomon. The transference of this particular title of Wisdom from the Son to the Holy Spirit had, then, already been made as early as the time of Athenagoras (A.D. 177). Wisdom generally had been transferred as a title to the Holy Spirit by Theophilus of Antioch in the famous passage in which he says that the three days which elapsed before the creation

[1] Athenagoras, *Supplicatio* 10.

Digitized by Google

of the luminaries are a type of the Trinity, i.e. of God and His Word and His Wisdom.

It appears, then, that ἀπόρροια is a classic term in the evolution of Christian theology. It denotes the procession of the Son from the Father, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father (and the Son). Now turn to the Odes. The sixth Ode opens with a prologue about the impossibility of resistance to God, and the impracticability of taking the position of an adversary to Him. The writer is thinking of the Wisdom of God which is described in the Sapiential Books in just such terms:[1] e.g.

Prov. iii. 15 *οὐκ ἀντιτάξεται αὐτῇ οὐδὲν πονηρόν.*

Sap. Sol. vii. 30 *σοφίας δὲ οὐκ ἀντισχύει κακία.*

From this prologue the Odist proceeds to his main theme, the coming of the ἀπόρροια: 'for there went forth a stream and it became a river', &c. It is clear that this effluence is either Wisdom itself, or it is some point of view of Christ or the Holy Spirit. In any case it is the classic ἀπόρροια that has turned up. Fortunately for us the Sahidic Bible preserved the term, and its importance was so evident that the writer of the *Pistis Sophia* makes it one of his main themes. He knows, moreover, that it was susceptible of an interpretation as an ἀπόρροια of Light as well as one of Water, and changes the Ode accordingly, with a persistent reference to the efflux of Light, of which the unfortunate *Pistis Sophia* has been deprived by malevolent powers. No one can read or understand the *Pistis Sophia* who does not observe the stress that is laid in it on the efflux of Light. The use and importance of the term being established and conceded, we can by no means derive the language or the involved doctrine from the Syriac language.

The Odist says in the Syriac that 'there went forth a brook'; this is quite colourless, and has nothing in it to guide us to the

[1] See, however, on this point the coincidence which we have noted with the *Apology of Aristides*.

Digitized by Google

Sapiential thought or language: in fact it misleads us, rather than leads us, for it suggests the torrent in Ezekiel which flows from the Temple, and our investigation has shown that this is not the right quarter in which to find the ἀπόρροια or its meaning. The use of this Greek term, taken from a Greek book, and expressive of a Greek theology, is, at first sight, decisive against the possibility of a derivation of the Odes from an original Syriac. The sixth Ode, in its fundamental conception, is Sapiential. The argument would be equally decisive against the belief in any other Semitic origin for the Odes; for the Wisdom of Solomon is a fundamentally Greek book, which has no Hebrew original behind it; and even if it had such an original (as Professor Margoliouth once tried to maintain), the chance that the Odist's 'translator' would have turned up the form ἀπόρροια in making his rendering is quite negligible. Thus the Odes are seen to be fundamentally and altogether Greek, unless the argument can be met from other quarters.

Now let us return to the seventh Ode, from which we have already detected a quotation in Eusebius. There is still something to be cleared up in the passage of the seventh Ode which we have been considering in a previous chapter. If we consider the verses referred to,

> 'He hath caused me to know Himself without grudging, in His simplicity
> For His kindness has minished His greatness,'

the question will arise as to the meaning of the words 'In His simplicity', when taken in connexion with the Incarnation, to which we have shown the succeeding words to apply. If we turn the words back into Greek we have:

> ἐν τῇ ἁπλότητι αὐτοῦ, ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης αὐτοῦ ἐσμίκρυνε τὴν μεγαλαιότητα.[1]

Now let us turn to Tatian's *Oration to the Greeks*. We shall find

[1] Connolly has already noted this: *J.T.S.*, 1913, p. 531.

Digitized by Google

that after establishing the doctrine of the One True God, he goes on to state the doctrine of the Logos as follows:

> 'With Him, through rational power, the Logos also itself which was in Him subsisted. By the will of his ἁπλότης springs forth the Logos; and the Logos, not having gone into vacuity, becomes the First-born Work of the Father.'
>
> Tatian, *Oratio* 5.

The words θελήματι τῆς ἁπλότητος, when spoken of the Incarnation, correspond closely to the language of the Ode. The only question is as to the meaning of the word ἁπλότης, which the Syriac gives in the sense of 'simplicity'. If this is really the meaning, the 'simplicity' referred to is that of the Divine Nature, alone in itself, and yet possessing in itself the δύναμις λογική. Thus the Divine Goodness makes His *simple* nature known by ministering His greatness. It has been suggested, however, that we ought to take the later meaning of ἁπλότης, and interpret it as 'liberality' and 'wealth', just as we interpret ἁπλῶς to mean not merely 'simply' but 'abundantly'. We should then have the sentence,

> 'By His liberality His kindness minished His greatness.'

Now turn back to the Syriac, and we shall see the alternative translation involved in the words 'without grudging', which correspond ordinarily to ἀφθόνως, and really mean 'abundantly', 'liberally'. Thus the Syriac may have made two translations of ἐν τῇ ἁπλότητι αὐτοῦ, and in that case is not the original. The Greek is the original, and corresponds closely to the language of Tatian, who may even have been acquainted with the Ode. A parallel passage in the Odes will be found in Ode xli. 10, where Christ is made to say:

> 'His *wealth* begat me
> And the thought of His heart.'

The arguments for a Greek original which we have been considering thus far are as follows:

(1) The 'midwife' passage in Ode xix: where the dependence is on the 22nd Psalm.

Digitized by Google

(2) The 'proselyte passage' in Ode xxv, with a probable dependence on Isaiah xlv, and a possible Greek play upon χρηστός and χριστός.

(3) The 'chariot' passage in Ode xxxviii, which depends on Psalm xliii and Psalm cvii, and has a possible reference (to which we have endeavoured to do justice) to the initiation of baptism.

(4) The 'Efflux' passage in Ode vi, with the assumed dependence on *Sap. Sol.* vii.

(5) The linguistic argument in Ode vii.

These are the five strongest arguments that we have found for a Greek-original: of these, we may say on review that the evidence for (1) inclines rather to the Greek side, unless we can adduce the Targum to turn the scales; for (2) the evidence is again somewhat in favour of the Greek, but not decisively. In (3) the difficulty of the Syriac reading is relieved (but not really got rid of) by substituting the Greek counterpart, and no definite conclusion can be reached; in (4) the argument for a Greek original appears at its clearest and strongest; in (5), the linguistic argument is somewhat on the side of a Greek original. The argument is not final, and it does not necessarily carry the whole body of the Odes, but it certainly has the field at present as regards the Odes in question.

Other suggestions of a Greek original may be found in the papers of Frankenberg, Preuschen, and Connolly, and will be discussed later.

It remains to be considered whether any light is thrown upon the original text of the Odes by the Biblical or semi-Biblical quotations which they contain. On this question of Biblical citations we have made a careful study in a previous chapter; the results of that examination would be naturally affected by the early date to which we have referred both the Odes (if Greek) and their Syriac form. It will be useless to look for coincidence with the Peshiṭta version of the New Testament in a document which antedates the time of Ephrem and Bardaisan. With the Old Testament the case is different, for there is reason to believe that some parts

of the Old Testament were rendered into Syriac at a very early date, directly from the Hebrew. So that here coincidences with the Peshiṭta on the part of the Odes would have weight. We have, however, seen that in the case of the most obvious Biblical semi-quotations their phraseology in the Odes is not always in accordance with the wording of the Old Testament Syriac. There are suspicions of an occasional Hebrew influence in quotations, and now and then the text of the Septuagint asserts itself; but it does not appear as if there was much in this region of inquiry to turn the scales very definitely one way or the other.

The real question that remains is as to whether there are sufficient genuine Semitisms in the Odes to set off against the numerous cases in which we have affirmed the existence of Greek language and Greek thought.

CHAPTER XIV

SYRIAC OR GREEK? (*continued*).

UP to this point we have found ourselves still in the region of uncertainty: some considerations pleaded strongly for a Syriac (or at all events a Semitic) original; others suggested Greek expressions at the back of the tradition of the Odes. Where we have thus far traced Biblical coincidences we did not get much that weighed the scales on one side or the other. Evidently we must make a closer study both of the Biblical allusions and of the general fabric of the Odes.

One thing, however, is coming out clearly, viz. that the portion of the Bible which, more than any other, underlies the Odes, is the Canonical Psalter, and next to that come the Sapiential books and Isaiah.

It may be suggested that this was something which could have been guessed in advance; for if we are making a book of hymns or Psalms of any length, it is only natural that it should imitate the style and thought of such Psalters as are already in existence.

Digitized by Google

This may readily be granted, so far as the use of the prevailing modes of thought is concerned, or the use of known metres and tunes. Ephrem, for instance, in order to displace Bardaisan's hymns and counteract their witchcraft, had to use Bardaisan's tools, his metres, and his harmonies; and Bardaisan went further than this: for if Ephrem tells true, he imitated David by making a new Psalter of 150 Psalms. Such a Psalter does more than affect unconsciously the style of Hebrew sacred song; it becomes a deliberate imitation, surely not confined to mere number. So the question is raised for us whether our book of Odes is also, in a deliberate sense, dependent upon the Psalter. That is the question to which we address ourselves. If it turn out that the question is answered affirmatively, and that the Odist has constantly one eye fixed on the Canonical Psalter, we may be in a position to decide more definitely the question of the dependence of the Odist upon the Septuagint or the Peshiṭta, that is, upon the relative order of the Greek or Syriac Odes.

Before we examine this point we may say a word or two about the supposed Bardaisan Psalter and certain Psalters that may be grouped with it or related to it.

The tradition of the Church knows of at least three second-century Psalters, besides our Odes, which cannot be later than the second century. That is, to all appearance, there were four separate Psalters current in the second century.

Now of these, the first is ascribed to Valentinus, the second to Marcion, and the third to Bardaisan. Of Valentinus and his Psalter Tertullian speaks with contempt:

> 'Nobis quoque ad hanc speciem Psalmi patrocinabuntur, non quidem apostatae et haeretici et Platonici Valentini, sed sanctissimi et receptissimi prophetae David.
>
> *De Carne Christi*, chap. 20.

Of Marcion we have a well-known statement in the Muratorian Canon, that amongst the books which the Church does not receive,

Digitized by Google

and the authors whom it rejects, must be reckoned the new Psalter made for Marcion, and its authors:

'Qui etiam novum psalmorum librum Marcioni conscripserunt.'

Of Bardesanes, Ephrem tells us that he composed hymns and Psalms in various metres, that he imitated David and composed 150 Psalms, and that he administered his false doctrine in this way to simple-minded people, like poison in ܚܠܝܐ (*Patr. Syr.* ii. 495).

The suggestion naturally arises whether these three lost Psalters are really independent, and whether they do not reduce to a single Psalter. Valentinus and Bardaisan are known to have some connexion one with the other, the latter having been, it is said, at one time a disciple of the former. On the other hand the tradition of independent Psalm-writing in Syriac is closely bound up with the name of Bardaisan and his followers; Ephrem could not have made a mistake on that head. So if any one is to disappear it should be Valentinus. We should be left in that case with Bardaisan as the great Psalmist of the second century, unless it could be shown that he had imitated Valentinus as well as David.

It becomes a matter of great interest to determine whether our new Odes are in any way related to the Psalms that we are discussing. Do they also imitate the Canonical Psalter? Are they heretical, say with Valentinus as author in general, as Preuschen promises to prove? Or with Valentinus and Bardaisan in particular, in ignoring the resurrection of the body?

It will be seen that the relation of the Odist to the Canonical Psalter is really one of importance; we must clearly do more than pick up a stray reference. The matter requires a closer scrutiny.

The inquiry is complicated, as Connolly and others have pointed out, by the fact that the Odist, when he quotes, deliberately alters his text. If, for instance, he is quoting as Paul does, the words:

'I believed, therefore have I spoken',

he makes out of it:

'I believed, therefore I was at rest.'

Digitized by Google

And it follows from this that when we find him quoting the Psalter the agreement is often, of necessity, limited; but, whether limited or not, it is that agreement that we are in quest of; the disagreement is not to be reckoned as of the first importance in the case of free-handling and of adaptation like that which the Odes offer us. It is the agreements that count. We know, then, what to ask for in searching the Odes that we may find the Psalms. We are looking for unmanipulated sentences and half-sentences and expressions. For we do find them, not merely those sentences which we have already tabulated, but a great deal more, and the closer we look the more we shall see. In not a few cases we can detect (i) a Psalm underlying the Ode, (ii) we can watch the Odist picking up the bits of the Psalm on which he is working and putting them together in the Ode that he is composing. The key to the Ode will then lie in the printing of a certain Psalm of David by the side of it and using it as a search-light. It will be convenient to do this generally in the notes that we attach to each translated Psalm, but one or two specimens may be given here in order to illustrate the method, and to help us with our problem of the relations of the Syriac to the Greek.

For example, when we read our first Ode, with its reference to a crown upon the writer's head that does not fade nor wither, but blossoms and bears fruit, we are evidently under the influence of the first canonical Psalm, where the righteous man is described under the terms of a tree planted by rivers of water, whose leaf does not wither, and which brings forth its fruit in its season. So much being clear, we have to find the motive for the statement in the Ode, that

> 'Thy fruits are full and perfect,
> Full of thy salvation.'

The parallel to this is:

> 'Whatsoever he doeth shall prosper',

taking 'doeth' in the Hebrew sense of 'producing fruits', (עשׂה פרי),

Digitized by Google

and making the subject of the verb the 'tree' in the previous sentence. This is actually the sense given by the Targum, and the Peshiṭta Syriac has preserved a trace of it by saying:

'Whatever he does he perfecteth'.[1]

This will serve as an illustration of the action of the Psalter upon the Ode. In the present case it seems clear that the action could not have been effected through the LXX. It might have come through the Targum or an early form of the Peshiṭta (which is known to have been under the influence of the Targum).

Now we begin to see the direction in which to go to work. Let us take another instance. In Ode xvii. 9 every one will recognize that the words

'I brake in pieces the bars of iron'

come from the 107th Psalm (Ps. cvi (cvii). 16). The agreement is complete as far as the Peshiṭta Psalter goes, every word used being the same; but one must not form a hasty judgement since both the Ode and the Peshiṭta have transliterated the Greek word for 'bars', which occurs in the LXX (μοχλούς). Why should they transliterate at all? Is their agreement in this transliteration a proof of interdependence? Does it mean that there was a Greek Ode for the original, agreeing at this point with the LXX, or was it a Syriac Ode that agreed with the Peshiṭta? A pretty problem!

However, we have caught the Odist pilfering from the Psalm, and we look round for more: in verse 4 the Odist says that 'the choking bonds were cut off by His hands'; on comparing the text with the Peshiṭta, we find that this is the same as verse 14 of the Psalm, which appears in the Greek as 'He brake their bands in sunder'. Here, then, we have a crucial instance. The Odist is not using the Greek Bible; he is using the Peshiṭta rendering of the Hebrew text.

[1] We follow the traditional vocalization.

Digitized by Google

Here is a similar instance in which use has been made of a very noble anti-ritualistic passage in the prophet Isaiah, where the true fast of the soul is described. In Ode xx. 9 the writer has borrowed from this passage the words

'His glory shall go before thee' (Isa. lviii. 8),

making, as his custom is, a slight adaptation of the words

'His righteousness shall go before thee,
And the glory of the Lord shall be thy rearward.'

He has just before said that one is to

'Come into Paradise and make a garland from its tree.'

This is taken from Isaiah lviii. 11:

'Thou shalt be as an irrigated garden.'

Here the Hebrew is 'garden' (גַּן), and the Greek is the same (κῆπος); *but the Syriac is 'Paradise'*.

Finally the Odist says:

'Thou shalt be *fat* in truth in the praise of His holiness.'

This also is taken from Isaiah lviii. 11:

'The Lord shall satisfy thy soul',

where the Syriac says 'satisfy with fatness'; ܕܗܢ 'to fatten' is the same as the word for 'fat' in the Ode. There are several other words available to express 'fatness'. If any doubt remained as to the dependence of the Odist on the Peshiṭta at this point, it would disappear on setting the two texts side by side, when it will at once become clear that the Odist is engaged in actual word-play with the Syriac text. We compare Isaiah lviii. 11 (Peshiṭta)

ܘܢܣܒܥ ܢܦܫܟ <u>ܒܕܘܗܢܐ ܘܢܫܪ</u> ܓܪܡܝܟ:

with Ode xx. 9

<u>ܘܬܕܗܢ ܒܫܪܪܐ</u> ܒܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܗ:

where the sequence of the underlined words shows that the Odist is playing with two different senses of the root ܫܪ 'to confirm or

establish', and 'to be true'. This appears to be decisive as to the dependence of the Odist upon the Syriac text.

We had a precisely similar word-play on the very same root in Ode xi. 5 ('I was *established* upon the rock of *truth*'); *vide supra*, p. 99.

These instances will show that we have picked up an important clue. We prove the dependence of the Ode (in these particular cases at least) from the Peshiṭta. That is a great point gained: it has history and chronology in it. It has long been suspected that portions of the Old Testament were done into Syriac at a very early date, by Jewish hands (or with the assistance of Jewish hands), and long before any portions of the New Testament had been done into Syriac. Such portions were the Psalter, then the Pentateuch, and perhaps some part of Isaiah. Our Odist has used this rendering.

If we can find sufficient cumulative evidence of this kind we may state the result in a general form. For this the reader is directed to the notes on the separate Odes. Supposing this reasoning to be justified, we must now go over the previous arguments on the opposite side, and see if they can be countered. If not, we shall have a bilingual Psalter, some of which was produced in Syriac and some in Greek, and then each part translated from the primary to the secondary language. In any case it must have been translated so early that we may safely assume its origin to be in a bilingual community, such as the district of Antioch. Probably the arguments referred to for Greek origins can be met upon further study. Provisionally, then, and with all due homage to light that may come from unexpected quarters, we suggest tentatively that the Syriac of the Odes is the original language in which they were composed.

On reviewing the foregoing argument, it may be instructive to compare the Odes with the Psalms of Solomon; and some one might say that the very same treatment may prove the Psalter of Solomon to be under the influence of the Peshiṭta Old Testament,

Digitized by Google

whereas we know that they come into the Syriac by translation from the Greek. Let us examine into this a little more closely.

It is evident to the most superficial reader who looks at the text of the Psalms of Solomon that it is saturated with Biblical language. If we remove the historical references and allusions to Pompey the great dragon and the Romans, we have often a mere cento of Old Testament references for the residue. A glance at the uncial-typed words in the edition of Ryle and James will show what we mean. When, however, we come to the detailed examination of these borrowed words and phrases, we do not find that the writer takes any special theme, as the Odist does, and reverts to it. We have only noted one place where a Psalm of the Old Testament that has been quoted appears to have lingered in his memory. In *Ps. Sol.* v. we have the following sequence:

Ps. Sol. v. 11. Thou givest rain in the desert to cause the grass to spring up, (Ps. civ. 11.)

v. 12. to prepare food in the wilderness for every living thing, (Ps. civ. 28; Ps. cxlv. 16.)
and if they be hungry, to thee they will lift up their faces. (Ps. civ. 27; Ps. cxlv. 15.)

v. 14. His soul shall be satisfied when thou openest thy hand in mercy. (Ps. civ. 28; Ps. cxlv. 16.)

There is no necessity, however, to refer more than the first of the passages quoted to the 104th Psalm, the remainder come from the 145th Psalm. Nor is there any peculiar agreement of the Psalter of Solomon at this point with the Syriac Psalter. So far from any such agreement being detected, the evidence is in the other direction.

We have examined a good many cases of occurrence of Biblical language in the Psalms of Solomon without finding more than superficial or inevitable coincidences; and there are many divergences in the language, and no special Syriac singularities. This is what we should naturally have expected. Our reason for alluding to it is to remove any possible misapprehension with regard to our linguistic criticism of the Odes.

Digitized by Google

Suppose we try and tabulate in a preliminary manner some of the results as to the original language of particular Odes which we have tentatively reached. We anticipate some results that will be worked out in the notes.

Ode i. Certainly of Semitic origin. (See explanation of 'fruits full and perfect'.)

Ode iv. Of Semitic origin: traces of Targumism.

Ode vi. Probably of Greek origin (reference to the *ἀπόρροια* of the Divine Wisdom).

Ode vii. Of uncertain origin; contains Wisdom references (Prov. viii. 22) and has very early attestation.

Ode viii. Of Syriac origin with some traces of Targumic influence

Ode ix. At first sight appears to be under the influence of LXX (cf. *λίθος τίμιος*), but see note, and reserve judgement.

Ode xvii. Based upon the 107th Psalm, Syriac version.

Ode xix. If the Ode is based on Proverbs ix it is a Greek Ode; the references to Psalm xxii are capable of either Greek or Syriac illustration.

Ode xx. Based on Isaiah lviii, and the evidence is in favour (but not conclusively in favour) of a Syriac origin.

Ode xxi. Certainly modelled on Psalm xxx in the Syriac version.

Ode xxiii. Probably based in its opening verses on the Greek of the third chapter of *Sap. Sol.*

Ode xxv. Decided suggestion of a Greek origin in closing verse.

Ode xxvi. Probably based on the 107th Psalm in Syriac (but some hesitation on account of the form of the refrain of the Psalm in the Peshiṭta).

Ode xxviii. Shows significant coincidence with the Syriac Psalter (an objection on the part of Connolly that in verse 4 it reflects a Greek *διό*).

Ode xxix. Indecisive references to the Psalter.

Ode xxx. Depends upon 24th chapter of the Wisdom of Sirach; probably Greek original.

Digitized by Google

Ode xxxvii. Probably Semitic in origin (suggestion of influence from Targum; cf. Ode i).

Ode xl. Apparently connected internally with Ode xx, and like that Ode dependent upon the Syriac of Isaiah lviii.

Ode xli. Shows acquaintance with the Hebrew of Proverbs viii. 22.

Ode xlii. Depends on Psalm lxxxviii, but not decisive as to Syriac or Greek.

This is a rapid glance at the phenomena of the textual transmission (omitting altogether the Syriacisms and Semitisms which we have collected elsewhere). It is perplexing because of the cross-evidence within the individual Odes. It would have been easy to affirm bilingual authorship and refer the hymns to the use of a bilingual church; but we have against this the lack of decisive evidence within the particular Psalms, and sometimes there is ambiguity which arises from the evidence being given on both sides. If we had to decide at this point we should be tempted to say that the Wisdom Odes were composed in Greek and the rest in Syriac; but the conclusion would be too rapid.

There remains, then, the internal evidence of Syriacism. This is abundant, but it requires sifting. For example, it is not a peculiar Syriacism to say that 'all who overcome shall be written (booked) in her book', for how else could one express it in Syriac?

There are, moreover, cases of supposed Syriacism like the 'midwife' passage in Ode xix, where the evidence can be countered as we have shown, so that it is not possible to leave the Syriac label any longer on the text without an attached mark of caution.

There are, however, very many Syriacisms and Aramaisms which we have tabulated, far beyond the natural accidents of a translator. Wellhausen made a distinction between 'biblisms' and 'Aramaisms', conceding the former and denying the latter. We may concede all the possible 'biblisms' like 'blessing he blessed me', and we have still a rich harvest of remaining Aramaisms. It is probable that these will be the deciding factor in the question,

Digitized by Google

and will require us to admit that the greater part of the Odes (to say the least) are of Syriac origin (*vide* supra, pp. 97–104).

Amongst the Aramaisms those will be felt to be of the greatest weight which involve Syriac word-play, with various meanings for the same root, or for related roots. Upon such cases, where they can be clearly made out, and upon the cases of influence from the Targums and the methods of Targums, the decision as to origins will ultimately be made (*vide* supra, pp. 101–3, 164).

To give one or two more illustrations, the 35th Ode will exhibit even to the eye of a person that knows no Syriac, that the writer is using recurrent expressions, almost coincident in form. The words ܐܛܠ, ܛܠܠܐ, ܛܠܝܐ, and ܛܠܐ stand up from the page. The Syriac scholar knows that three different roots are being played with, conveying the ideas of 'dew', 'shelter', and 'boyhood'. These ideas are woven together in the Ode, and the assonance, which even the eye can detect, is the key to the Ode. This cannot possibly be Greek work: it may be bad philology, but it is Syriac philology. And when we have proved this 35th Ode to be a Syriac product, a very little study will show that the result carries with it a similar conclusion for other Odes, such as the 36th Ode where the same 'cloud of dew' is detected, and can be traced to an ultimate origin in the Syriac of Isaiah and the Targum.

Equally decisive is the study of Targum quotations and the use of Targum methods of interpretation. The Odes are full of both. The Odist is always avoiding anthropomorphism in the Targumist's manner. He is constantly saying 'Before the Lord' instead of 'the Lord', or quoting the 'Name of the Lord', or the 'Word of the Lord', in the place of 'the Lord'. As soon as we take this key into our hands any number of textual locks fly open. We see at once why, in Ode xxix. 9, 'War is made by the Word', and 'Victory taken by the Word', for the writer is making metre out of the Targum on the 110th Psalm.

We see why in Ode xxii 'the name of the Lord' was surrounding the Odist; it is a Targumist periphrasis for 'the Lord is round

Digitized by Google

about his people' (Ps. cxxv. 2). And it is not merely an oral Targum, or the method of an oral Meturgeman that is employed; sometimes we catch the Odist poring over a written Targum and picking up stray expressions from it. See the notes on Ode xxxv, where it is shown that the motive for the expression 'More than shelter was He to me' is caught up from the Targum.

No doubt these discoveries of the influence of the Targum and its closely related Peshiṭta text upon the Odes are of ultimate importance for the history of the Targum itself; but the immediate result is that they carry the Odes back into the time when the Church was still adjacent to the Synagogue, and they show conclusively the Aramaic origin of the Odes in which the influence of Targum can be traced.

We may make a reserve, if we please, for the possible bilingualism of the author; he *may* have known some Greek, he *must* have known a great deal of Aramaic; he *may* have known the Septuagint; he *must* have known the Hebrew, the Peshiṭta, and the Targum. With the reserve in question which comes under the formula *exceptis excipiendis*, we affirm the Aramaic origin of the Odes. The result has been reached after a close and careful inquiry, with the scales vibrating alternately to this side and that; in our judgement they have now inclined to one side.

It must be clear to any who has followed carefully the argument up to the present point, that the introduction of the idea of the Targum is the decisive factor in the solution of the problem before us. If we can show either the methods of a Meturgeman or the actual use of a Targum, the problem is solved so far as relates to the Odes in which such methods and influences are at work.

It would take us too long to discourse at length on the mentality of the Aramaic interpreter of the Scripture to a congregation; and in the collection of readings that may be fairly described as Targum we have a wide area to select from. We know that we must not ascribe personality to God in terms borrowed from human life, and that we must say 'Word of God'

Digitized by Google

instead of 'God'. We must not say that 'God sees' or that 'God knows', much less that He 'walks' or 'smells sweet savours'. If we want to say that 'He knows', let us say 'it is revealed and known before Him', and generally let the periphrase 'done before Him' be used for everything that He does. This consideration alone should have betrayed the secret to us; for the Odist uses the very expression 'it was revealed' which is current all over the Targums (ܓܠܝܐ, ܐܬܓܠܝ). And the abnormal recurrence of ܩܕܡ (*before* a person) should have been recognized.

As for expressions to be avoided, a good plan will be to read through a section of the Pentateuch or Prophets or Psalms, and see what changes are chronic. For example, God is never called 'a rock' in the Targums, but he may be called 'the strong one'. In the Psalms where the appellation of 'rock' occurs, this substitution is chronic; and we shall see why the Odist who is working so constantly on the Psalter never uses the term. In one case there is a reference to 'foundations laid upon God's rock', but that is not the same thing. What was the ultimate reason for the avoidance of the term we are not at present in a position to determine.

The recurrence in the Odes of the expression 'His Word' is not to be taken as necessarily Targumic; but sometimes it must be so taken, for it will be seen to be a substitute for, or an evasion of, the utterance of the Divine Name. When we say that 'His Word is with us in all our way', or that the Lord has 'bridged the rivers by His Word', or 'my voice fell to him and his Word came to me', we are dealing with what may fairly be labelled as Targum.

This relates, however, to the method of the Meturgeman, which appears to be also, if occasionally, the method of the Odist. Method is one thing: actual employment of existing Targums is another. It is here that our investigation becomes decisive, for we shall find over and over again that we have to refer an expression in the Odes to the Targum or to the closely related Peshiṭta, if we are to understand it rightly. The proof of this

Digitized by Google

statement must be sought in the foot-notes to the separate Odes. We believe it will be accepted as final and conclusive.

This does not mean that the Odist is always making or quoting Targum. Sometimes he speaks as a Meturgeman would have been slow to do, of God's 'right hand', or the 'Lord's hand': and we doubt if any Meturgeman would have invented or tolerated the 'breasts of God'. The use of such expressions does not invalidate the statement that the Odist can be shown to have, in certain places, Targumized.

We must observe also that the value of this discovery is two-fold: first of all, it is of value with regard to the Targum itself, whose antiquity and written transmission is established more clearly than ever; second, it makes the Odes themselves into a commentary upon the older Scriptures as well as a book of songs. Such a commentary is of the highest value; just as the Targum on the Scripture is regarded by the interpreter of Scripture as an 'inestimable treasure', so the Odes, in so far as they reflect the Targum, acquire additional worth and value, and constitute a precious link between the Judaism of Palestine in the first century of our era and the Christianity of the same period.

Enough has been said to accentuate the importance of the conclusions to which we have been led in a somewhat extended and often perplexing investigation.

A very judicious summary of the arguments for and against a Greek original for the Odes will be found in Tondelli's excellent edition to which we have already made reference. Tondelli, indeed, concludes for a Greek original, but that is not altogether surprising: many of the considerations which we have adduced for an opposite view are new, and our own first judgement was the same as that of Tondelli and the majority of the critics. Bernard, however, expressed his belief definitely in a Syriac original, though he was unable to work the thesis out; Abbott made a strong fight (against Connolly and others) for a Semitic base; and Grimme went so far as to turn the Odes back into classical Hebrew, and even

Digitized by Google

declared that they showed traces of Acrostic arrangement according to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet! Bruston brought forward cases of Syriac assonance, and of Syriac corruption, but as Tondelli rightly observes, his instances were not very strong. For example, it was surely incorrect to suppose that in the opening verse of Ode xxxiv there was an intentional assonance between ܩܫܝܐ (hard) and ܦܫܝܛܐ (simple): the Oriental does not confuse the sounds in question: to him, at all events, they are not assonant.

On the other hand, many of the arguments for a Greek original have also disappeared in the course of the investigation. It was quite natural to suppose that when the Odist uses the expression ܪܒܘܬ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ, he was translating literally from the Greek *μεγαλοπρέπεια* in the two instances where the expression occurs. Only it had been overlooked that the Syriac Psalter had already made the expression common property, so that there was no need to think of translation at all. The same thing is true of a number of primitive forms like ܠܐ ܡܚܒܠܐ = *ἄφθαρτος* or ܠܐ ܚܣܡ = *ἀφθόνως*; for it can be shown that such forms were at home in the Syriac language and literature from the earliest times; Ephrem, for example, uses them freely, and without any possible suspicion of translation. There is really no reason why the writer of the Odes, if a Syrian, should not have employed the transliteration of *πρόσωπον*, *κίνδυνος*, or *γένος*. These are superficial Grecisms, and not necessarily evidences of an immediate derivation from Greek. Frankenberg, by retranslating the Odes into Greek, was able to take the argument somewhat deeper; the suggestion in Ode xxx that the couplet:

> ' It flows forth from the mouth of the Lord,
> And from the heart of the Lord is its Name,'

had been affected by a misreading of *νᾶμα* (flow) for *ὄνομα* (name) was certainly striking, and restored parallelism to the members of the couplet. It is, however, possible that there may be a Syriac explanation of the passage. See our note on the verse.

Digitized by Google

Another suggestive instance is in the 13th Ode, where Frankenberg and Preuschen would have us restore

'Open your eyes and see *yourselves* in Him';

thus reading *αὑτούς* (= *ἑαυτούς*) instead of *αὐτούς*, and crediting the translation with a wrong reference of *αὐτούς* to the eyes instead of the observers. The suggested modification of an assumed underlying Greek text was very attractive. We should also note that the expression in Ode vii. 17 ('harp of many *voices*') may very well be the equivalent of a Greek *κιθάρα πολύφωνος*.

Somewhat different is Nestle's suggestion that in Ode vii. 12 we should read *οὐσία* for the implied *θυσία*, a very easy change in Greek uncial writing. This interpretation would give us an original sentence to the effect, 'He granted me that I should ask of Him and partake of His nature', presumably in the attainment of immortality as a gift of God. We might compare 2 Peter i. 4, where believers are said to become 'partakers of the Divine Nature', but here the word is *φύσις* and not *οὐσία*. There is, however, a doubt whether any change is necessary: we have suggested in the note that the Syriac is intelligible as it stands, and that it means:

'That I should ask of Him
And receive of His *largesse*.'

These, then, are some of the best cases for Grecism.

Connolly, who spent a good deal of time and labour in vindicating the priority of the Greek text, made an interesting point out of the words:

'I believed, *therefore* I was at rest.'[1]

The argument is that the Odist, after his usual manner, is imitating a canonical Psalm with slight variations in the terms of speech or the language used. In this case it will be Psalm cxvi. 10,

[1] Is there any connexion with Heb. iv. 4: 'We who have believed do enter into rest'?

Digitized by Google

'I believed, *therefore* have I spoken', and we are entitled to affirm that the word 'therefore' is taken from the Psalter. It answers, in fact, to the διό of the Septuagint, which will be found reflected in the Pauline correspondence at 2 Corinthians iv. 13. This διό is not represented in the Syriac text of the Psalms, which simply says, 'I believed and I spake'. Connolly, not unnaturally, concluded that it was not the Syriac Psalter that underlay the language of the Ode. A past tense, too, seemed to be postulated for the model which has been imitated by the expression 'therefore I was at rest'; and this is not the Hebrew of the Psalm which runs:

'I believe, therefore *I will speak*.'

Thus there was a slight balance in favour of the Septuagint. We note, however, that the Targum has also the desiderated 'therefore', so that its omission by the Peshiṭta is not quite decisive of the question. As it stands, the balance of the argument is on Connolly's side, unless it should be overborne by the general considerations contained in the previous pages of the present work.

We may now relegate the discussion of other and minor points of difference between the Greek hypothesis and the opposing Syriac to the notes attached to the translation of the individual Odes. We have been anxious not to omit anything of importance in the extant criticisms of the Odes, but it is permissible to pass over in silence some things which do not require a serious refutation or a sustained discussion.

CHAPTER XV

The Coptic (Sahidic) Version.

We have already explained that five of the Odes of Solomon are found embedded in that curious Gnostic book which goes under the name of *Pistis Sophia*. In this book a number of the Psalms of David and the afore-mentioned five Odes of Solomon are the basis of the penitences which the unfortunate Sophia addresses

Digitized by Google

to the Saviour, disguised in each case by the substitution of Gnostic language for that of the selected Psalm or Ode. Then the Psalm having been identified by some one of the Disciples, male or female, we have the actual text of that Psalm or Ode, after which in a number of cases the Gnostic Targum and the Biblical text are gone over, sentence by sentence, for the purpose of comparison, so that we have the Ode or Psalm in two forms, and sometimes in what looks like a third.

Evidently we must try and find out what light the text of the *Pistis Sophia* and the methods of its author can throw on the origin of the Odes.

The first thing that comes to light in reading the *Pistis Sophia* is that its Old Testament is the Septuagint, and not the Hebrew nor the Peshiṭta Syriac, which is based for the most part on the Hebrew.

For instance, the first passage of Scripture discussed is Isaiah xiv. 1, 3, 12, which is explained as follows by the Virgin Mary (in quoting we use the translation of Schwartze-Petermann):

> 'Locuta est hoc modo vis, quae in Esaia προφήτῃ et protulit eum in παραβολῇ πνευματικῇ, tempore quo dixit *de ὁράσει Aegypti*, id est:
>
> 'Ubi, igitur, Aegypte, ubi sunt tui divinatores, et ordinatores horae: et hi, *qui vocant e terra et hi, qui vocant ex sese.* Monstranto tibi facinora, quae perpetrabit Dominus Sabaoth.'

The heading, *ὅρασις Αἰγύπτου*, and the equivalents for *ἐκ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας* and *ἐγγαστριμύθους*, betray the use of the Septuagint, or of an Egyptian translation based upon the Septuagint.[1]

In this passage it will be found on examination that it is Jesus who is speaking Gnostically and is interpreted by Mary. A similar case will be found when we come to the sixth Ode of Solomon, where again it is Jesus who has to be interpreted and not the

[1] The chapter quoted must have been often in use in the propagation of the Christian religion in Egypt, since it predicts the return of Egypt from idolatry to monotheism and the service of Jahweh.

Digitized by Google

repentant Sophia. So it was not absolutely true that the book was made out of the penitences of Sophia, which some have imagined, apparently without sufficent reason, to be incorporated from without in the texture of the *Pistis Sophia.*

Returning to the text of the Psalms in the *Pistis Sophia* we may make comparison with the Sahidic Psalter recently published by Dr. Budge from a papyrus of the sixth century, and we shall find in the greater part of the Psalms discussed, that the coincidence is so close (often there will hardly be a sensible variation in the texts) as to leave no doubt that the Sahidic Psalter was extant when the *Pistis Sophia* was written, and that it was employed by the author. Now this Sahidic Psalter is simply the Septuagint done out of Greek into Sahidic. Unless, then, the *Pistis Sophia* has substituted the Sahidic version for some other version which lay before the author, of which he has avoided the trouble of making a fresh translation, there is a strong presumption that the *Pistis Sophia* is a genuine Coptic book, and not a rendering of some other work (Greek or Syriac) into Coptic. Let us see if we can confirm this by a closer examination.

Towards the end of the book the problem is raised as to what is to be done with persons who are baptised but do not bring forth fruits meet for repentance. The story which deals with the problem is as follows:

> 'After these things Jesus, seeing a woman who came to repent, baptised her three times, though she had not done anything worthy of baptism. And the Saviour, wishing to try Peter, in order to see whether he was merciful and remitted sins, as He had commanded him, said to Peter: "Lo! these three times I have baptised this soul, and in these three times she has done nothing worthy of the Mystery of Light. Why then does she also render the body useless? Now, therefore, Peter, perform the Mystery of Light, which cuts off souls from the Inheritance of Light; perform that mystery, so as to cut off this woman from the Inheritance of Light." When the Saviour, therefore, had said these things, he tried Peter, to see whether he was merciful and forgiving. When, therefore, the

> Saviour had said these things, Peter said, "My lord, leave her alone this time also, that I may give her the sublime mysteries. And if she turns out useful, you allow her to inherit the Kingdom of Light." When Peter had said these words, the Saviour recognized that Peter was merciful like Himself and forgiving.'

Evidently we have been treated to a Gnostic Targum upon the parable of the barren fig-tree in Luke xiii. The explanation promptly follows, for the writer continues:

> 'When, therefore, all these things had taken place, the Saviour said to his disciples, "Have ye understood all these things and the pattern of this woman?" Mary answered and said, "My lord, I understand that mystery of the words which were done to this woman; concerning the things, then, that were done to her, thou didst speak to us aforetime in a parable, saying: 'A certain man had a fig-tree, in his vineyard. And he came seeking its fruit, and found nothing in it. He said to the gardener: Lo! three years do I come seeking fruit in this fig-tree and I find nothing in it. Cut it down, therefore, why does it also cumber the ground? But he answered and said to him: My Lord, let it alone this year also until I shall dig about it and give it dung; and if it produce fruit next year, *you leave it alone*; but if you do not find anything you cut it down.' Behold, my lord, this is the solution of the matter." The Saviour answered and said to Mary: "Very good, spiritual woman, that is exactly the case."'

Here, then, we have a parable of the New Testament treated in precisely the same way as the Psalms and Odes. We have a passage of the Sahidic New Testament before us, and a Gnostic Targum, apparently, on the same. When we look closely at the Sahidic text we see a number of readings peculiar to that version. For instance, the lacuna in the unfinished Greek sentence in verse 9:

κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον—

is filled up by the explanatory word ⲁⲕⲕⲁⲁⲥ (= *sinis eam*): the word creeps back into the Greek in the bilingual (Graeco-Sahidic) codex T in the form *ἀφήσεις*.

Digitized by Google

Now let us look back at the Gnostic Targum on the passage and we find the same Sahidic gloss in the sentence:

'Et si fuerit utilis, *sinis eam κληρονομεῖν* regnum lucis.'

From which it appears that the Targumist was also operating on a Sahidic text. So then, for our purposes, it is clear that the *Pistis Sophia* is a Sahidic book, and the writer is using his Sahidic Bible, from which he took, as need required, Psalms, Odes of Solomon, Prophecies of Isaiah, Gospels, &c. The Old Testament upon which he operated was itself based upon the Greek text of the LXX, and the Odes of Solomon were, for the author of the *Pistis Sophia*, a translation of the Greek, fragments of which lay before him in the untranslated Greek words that adorn his text. Now when we examine side by side the Coptic text of a Psalm of David, as it occurs in the penitences of Sophia, with the same Psalm as it occurs in the Sahidic Psalter of Dr. Budge, we see no difference, or hardly any difference, in the transferred Greek words, any more than we do in the Psalms generally. Occasionally one or other of the contrasted texts may replace a Greek word by its Coptic equivalent: for instance, in Psalm xxxiv (xxxv). 3:

ⲁϫⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲯⲩⲭⲏ ϫⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉⲛⲟⲩⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ

the *Pistis Sophia* has

. . . . ⲡⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩϫⲁï (= σωτηρία).

In Psalm xxx (xxxi). 12:

ⲁïⲣ ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲁϥⲥⲱⲣⲙ̄:

the *Pistis Sophia* has

. . . . ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲕⲉⲩⲟⲥ . . . . . . :

In the former case the Psalter has the original Greek word (σωτήρ standing for σωτηρία); in the latter the *Pistis Sophia* has preserved the original σκεῦος of the Septuagint. In neither case has the Coptic text been Grecized by the author of the *Pistis Sophia*.

The importance of these observations lies in their application to the Odes that are mixed with the Psalms in the *Pistis Sophia*.

Digitized by Google

In every case where a Greek word, or a fragment of a Greek word, is found in the text of the Odes in the *Pistis Sophia*, we are entitled, unless some strong reason can be shown to the contrary, to read back that Greek word into the lost Greek of the Odes. We have already seen the importance of this in the Sapiential word *ἀπόρροια*, which is thus vindicated for the Ode in which it occurs; and we may be sure that such a highly specialized and profoundly theological word never came into our Coptic text except from the Greek. A Syriac intermediary or a Hebrew antecedent is not to be thought of.

The next thing that we may be reasonably sure of is that the primary authority for the text of the Ode is not the Gnostic Targum; it must be clearly shown that the text which underlies the Targum differs from that which is in the Bible of the composer of the *Pistis Sophia*, before the Targum comes into evidence at all; and even when it differs the Biblical text has a prejudice in its favour; it must not be disturbed except for very strong reasons.

We may, however, observe that occasionally the Biblical text in the *Pistis Sophia* shows internal traces of variation or of correction. Here is an instance:

In Psalm lxviii (lxix). 2, where the text of the LXX is

ἐνεπάγην εἰς ἰλὺν βυθοῦ,

the Sahidic has, according to Dr. Budge's edition,

ⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲱⲗ̄ⲥ ⲉⲧⲗⲟⲓ̈ϩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲛ:

while the *Pistis Sophia* has

ⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲱⲗ̄ⲥ ⲏ̀ ⲁⲓ̈ⲱⲙ̄ⲥ ⲉⲧⲗⲟⲓ̈ϩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲛ:

('infixus sum *aut immersus* in coenum abyssi').

Here we have an alternative rendering for ἐνεπάγην which has crept into the text. Lower down in the Psalms, where the word recurs (ἵνα μὴ ἐμπαγῶ), there is no variation suggested The first rendering is clearly ⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲱⲗ̄ⲥ: the other is a reviser's correction. The advantage we gain from such corrections is, that we can see that

Digitized by Google

the Sahidic Psalter has a history of its own, even before the time when we find it made use of in the *Pistis Sophia*. We must also be careful to see that we do not justify casual omissions of single words, half verses, &c., with which any manuscript is likely to be affected.

Let us now look a little more closely into the relations one to another of the forms in which the *Pistis Sophia* presents to us any Ode of Solomon which it quotes or works over. In the most extended case we have three forms: (i) the Ode itself; (ii) the Gnostic Targum on the Ode; (iii) the Commentary upon the Ode, which last is made by taking sentences, one after another, from the Ode and equating them with their proper Targum. Strictly speaking, the third form ought to add nothing to the other two; for if the sentences are properly transcribed and accurately paralleled, no new matter is introduced. But we shall find cases in which this is not confirmed. If we call the Coptic text C, the Targum T, and the Commentary *com*, then *com* ought to break up into two parts, *com* 1 and *com* 2, of which *com* 1 should equal C and *com* 2 should equal T. We must examine carefully into cases where this is not found to be verified.

Suppose we take a specimen passage. In the sixth Ode we find the following sequence (we quote the Latin rendering of Schwartze-Petermann for convenience, without trying to reform it in every particular):

verse 15 comprehenderunt animas (ψυχάς) eiicientes halitum, ne morerentur.

verse 16 restituerunt membra (μέλη) quae ceciderunt.

For this the Targum is:

> vivificarunt σῶμα eius ὕλης, in qua nullum lumen, haec quae peritura est aut haec quae perit, et constituerunt eius vires omnes, quae erant solvendae.

And the Commentary is :

verse 15, *com* 1 vivificarunt ψυχάς, eiicientes halitum, ut ne morerentur.

Digitized by Google

com 2 vivificarunt σῶμα eius ὕλης, a quo lumina sua abstulerunt prius, hoc, quod erat periturum.

verse 16, *com* 1 constituerunt μέλη, quae collapsa sunt, aut ut ne collaberentur.

com 2 quum intulissent in eam eius lumina, constituere (i. e. erexere) eius vires omnes, quae erant dissolvendae.

Here we have three peculiarities to explain: (i) the substitution of *vivificarunt* for *comprehenderunt* in *com* 1; (ii) the double rendering in the Targum which is not exhibited by *com* 2; (iii) the double rendering in *com* 1, which does not appear in C.

That *comprehenderunt* is right may be seen from its correspondence with the Syriac: the eye of the Commentator has wandered to the Targum which he was comparing with the text, so as to read *vivificarunt*. The double rendering in the Targum, which wavers between a future participle and a present tense, appears in the Coptic in the form:

ⲧⲁⲓ̈ ⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲁⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲡⲉ
ⲏ ⲧⲁⲓ̈ ⲉ ϣⲁⲥⲧⲁⲕⲟ

Here we may recognize a variant translation of the Greek, just as we did in a previous case: we conjecture that the difficulty arose in translating the Greek text:

ψυχὰς αἵτινες ἔμελλον ἀποθνήσκειν·

which would answer very nearly to the Syriac:

ܕܥܬܝܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܡܡܬ

The alternative reading probably found its way in from the margin of the text of the Odes.

The other double translation is similar: the text of the Odes has:

ⲁⲩⲧⲁϩⲟ ⲛ̄ ϩⲉⲛ ⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲉ ⲁⲩϩⲉ

to which the Commentary adds:

ⲏ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲩϩⲉ

Digitized by Google

We need not assume any variation in the underlying Greek, it was probably:

ἀνώρθωσαν τὰ μέλη τὰ παραλελυμένα,

very nearly as in Isaiah xxxv. 3.

If we make an allowance for a few cases in which the reading of the Targum may be nearer to the Syriac than the reading of the Coptic Ode, we do not need to make any detachment of the Targum from the Coptic text which accompanies it, so as to assume that the Gnostic parts of the *Pistis Sophia* belong to an independent tradition which has been re-incorporated with the Odes by the author of the *Pistis*. We have already pointed out that the same method of Gnosticising a Scripture text prevails throughout the book, and is applied both to Old and New Testaments. Any thoughts of separating out the *Penitences of Sophia* must be abandoned.

Mr. Worrell has attempted, in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October 1911, to prove that 'the Syriac through its ancestor was influenced by those very Gnostic Hymns which are now in the *Pistis Sophia*, and that these were at an early date in circulation apart from that book, and wholly independent of it, forming a collection of Gnostic Hymns parallel to the orthodox Odes from which they were derived'. We have not been convinced by his reasoning, which is incompatible with what we believe to be the right view of the antiquity of the Syriac text; nor do we think with him that 'for several reasons it is likely that the *Pistis Sophia* was composed in Greek and translated into Coptic as a whole'. It is possible that there may be sections (perhaps of Valentinian origin) to which this supposition of Greek origin will apply, but we do not think it is true of the *Penitences of Sophia*, nor of the *Pistis Sophia* as a whole. Special cases of the kind to which Mr. Worrell alludes, and upon which he builds his arguments, will be found discussed in our notes as they arise.

The question of the relations between the Coptic and Syriac Odes would have to be considered from quite another point of view if it could be maintained that the Syriac Odes were Nitrian

Digitized by Google

in origin. Tondelli, in his excellent book *Le Odi di Salomone*, has tried to prove this,[1] first, by affirming, with Burkitt, that the MSS. of the Odes are Monophysite in origin; second, by a detailed proof of the close connexion between Syrian and Egyptian monachism; and third, by laying stress on the fact that our oldest MS. comes from Nitria, and that the Odes were certainly at home in Egypt at a very early period. But he sees clearly the weakness of the position, and admits that the Nitrian origin of the Syriac text would have to be abandoned if the dependence of Ephrem upon the Odes, as maintained by Harris and Wensinck, were conceded.[2]

We have given further proofs, not only of the dependence of Ephrem on the Syriac Odes, but, probably, also of Bardaisan. So that it is not necessary to follow the Nitrian hypothesis any further. The Odes were extant in Greek and in Syriac before the Nitrian desert was thought of as a paradise for monks, a home alike for learning and religion.

There is one direction in which the foregoing reasoning may appear to be invalidated. We tested our Sahidic Psalms where they occurred in the *Pistis Sophia* by comparing them with Dr. Budge's Psalter, and found the agreement to be phenomenally close, except for five Psalms which occur on pp. 86–110 of the *Pistis*. Rahlfs had compared the Psalms with a Berlin MS. of the Sahidic Psalter, and had made the same statement.[3]

The question arises as to how we are to explain the variation of the text of these five Psalms, viz. Psalms xxx (xxxi), xxxiv (xxxv), li (lii), cviii (cix), cxix (cxx). Do they constitute with their Gnostic counterparts a separate document which has been incorporated with the *Pistis Sophia*? Or are they a section of the *Pistis Sophia* which has escaped revision or been unequally revised, by com-

[1] Loc. cit., p. 38.

[2] 'L'origine nitriaca della versione sarebbe da negarsi qualora si dovesse riconoscere la dipendenza di S. Efrem dalle Odi, sostenuta dall' Harris, *Expositor* decembre 1911, e Wensinck, *Expositor* febbraio 1912.'

[3] *Die Berliner Handschrift des sahidischen Psalters*, 1901.

Digitized by Google

parison with the Sahidic Psalter? Let us first of all make the matter clearer to our minds by actually comparing the text of the shortest Psalm of the group with the Sahidic Psalter, Psalm cxix (cxx). There are certainly variants in the translation, e.g. in verse 4 the *Pistis* has ϣⲟⲗϭ where the Psalter has ⲧⲏⲙ; and in verse 7 the Psalter has ϣⲁⲩϯ ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲓ̈ where the *Pistis* has ϣⲁⲩⲙⲓϣⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲓ̈, the meaning in each case being the same. The only variation in the underlying Greek text appears to be ἤ for *καί* in verse 3, a variant which will be found in the apparatus of the LXX. The text of the Psalter keeps closer to the Greek in rendering *πολλά* in verse 6 by ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ, than the *Pistis*, while the *Pistis* has ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩ ⲙⲏⲏϣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁ (= *in multis locis*).

In both versions the last clause of verse 6 is placed after the first clause of verse 7, a very striking agreement. Even more remarkable is the fact that the very same Greek transliterations (*ψυχή, ἄνθρακες, εἰρηνικός, εἰρήνη*), occur in both versions. If this feature is consistently present throughout the group of Psalms, then the two translations are not independent. Suppose we test the matter further in Psalm xxx (xxxi).

The translations differ as before at certain points: e.g. in verse 5 the Greek *παγίς* is rendered by ⲡⲁϣ in the *Pistis*, and by ϭⲟⲣϭⲥ in the Psalter,[1] and there are a good many other differences, but apparently none that imply a different Greek text. The transliterations which are common are as follows: *δικαιοσύνη, πνεῦμα, δέ, εὐφραίνεσθαι, ψυχή (ter), ἀνάγκαι, θλίβειν, κλῆροι, ἀσεβεῖς, δίκαιος, ἀνομία*. The only variation in transliteration is that the *Pistis* has *σκεῦος* in verse 12, where the Psalter has a Sahidic equivalent ϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ. These coincidences again can hardly be accidental: they suggest that the translations are not to be considered as independent.

Of the two the *Pistis* appears to be the earlier in the retention of the Greek *σκεῦος*, which has disappeared in the Psalter: the two versions are not, however, to be regarded as different. It appears,

[1] The same variation occurs in Psalm xxxiv (xxxv). 7, 8, but in the latter part of verse 8 the Psalter and the *Pistis* reverse their translation.

Digitized by Google

then, that a certain point in the *Pistis*,[1] perhaps in a particular quire or quires of the original composition, the writer (or was it his translator?) used a second copy of the Sahidic Psalter, of a somewhat earlier type, but not fundamentally different from the one which he normally employed. We see no reason for assuming discontinuity in the text of the *Pistis*, or interpolation. The argument of the book is continuous, and the text must not be broken up.

It is not necessary for our present work to decide all the unsettled questions with regard to the *Pistis Sophia*. Schmidt is very decided that it and all the associated Gnostic books are translations from the Greek: he will not hear of a possible Sahidic original. We suggest that the matter needs some further elucidation. If the original is Greek, the Sahidic Bible has been used by the translator in presenting the Psalms and other parts of the Scripture that were in his text. In that case there should be no Sahidic variants in the Gnostic portions of the book. Are we quite sure of this? If such Sahidic variants should be detected, could the Greek original be any longer maintained?

We may be satisfied that the Odes of Solomon were extant both in Greek and Sahidic, and that the Sahidic (however it passed into the *Pistis*) is based on an original Greek.

It should be noticed, in leaving this part of the inquiry, that there is reason to hope that the Odes may some day turn up in a complete form in Sahidic. Another direction that seems hopeful for further discovery is the literature of the Ethiopic Church. The Abyssinians have a literary cult of Solomon, whom they regard as the father of their first king, through the much-wandered Queen of Sheba. For this reason they assiduously copied the book of Proverbs, the Canticles, and the Sapiential books. It is very likely that they paid attention to the Odes of Solomon also, though we have not yet found any trace of them in the Ethiopic literature.

[1] The change occurs in the MS. of the *Pistis* between ff. 79 and 99; this looks like quires 9–10 in a book written in quires of ten leaves.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVI

THE ODES AND BAPTISM.

LET us now turn to the discussion of the interpretation made of the Odes of Solomon by Dr. Bernard, according to whom they are a series of baptismal hymns to be employed ritually in the initiation of catechumens in the period that precedes the Easter baptisms. They are not mystical in the sense of being pure spiritual aspirations, and expressions of personal experience; they are to be regarded as sacramental in intention, and almost, if not quite, liturgical in character. Even the fact of their being forty-two in number is significant; for they were to be sung *de die in diem* during the period that extends from the first Sunday in Lent to Easter Eve. As they are of a Palestinian, or at all events a West-Syrian origin, it is natural to explain their occurrence in the lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem to the candidates for baptism in the year A.D. 348. Bernard was able to show that the opening lecture of the series was marked strongly by reminiscence of the first Ode of Solomon; and on the hypothesis offered it was significant that the 42nd Ode, which deals with the release of the prisoners in Hades, should fall on the Saturday before Easter. Cyril, indeed, does not give a special lecture on the *Descent into Hades* (if indeed he has the article in his creed), and on Easter Eve he is occupied with the *Resurrection of the Body, the Catholic Church, and the Life Everlasting.*[1] He does discuss the subject in his fourteenth lecture, on the Resurrection of Christ, and here, as we have already pointed out, there is a distinct reminiscence of the 42nd Ode (*vide supra*, p. 55). The acquaintance of Cyril with the

[1] The Lectures were twenty-four in number, one of which is introductory, and the last five are post-baptismal, and delivered after Easter, so that chronological parallelism between the supposed Lenten *Odes* and the *Lessons to Candidates* must not be unduly pressed.

Digitized by Google

Odes must be conceded, as we have shown in a previous chapter; and it is an acquaintance with the same book of Odes that is known to ourselves.

Assuming, for a while, Dr. Bernard's position and using Cyril's lectures as a commentary on the Odes, we can readily find a number of striking parallels, over and above the crown which blossoms and bears perfect fruit in the first Ode and in the Introductory Lecture.

In the first lecture Baptism is spoken of as the 'Seal of Salvation, that wondrous seal at which devils tremble, and which angels recognize': this suggests that we identify the Seal in Ode iv, which is 'known to God's creation, and with which the elect archangels are clad', with the Seal of Baptism.

In the same lecture, believers are spoken of, as 'planted in the spiritual Paradise and receiving a new name'. The 'Paradise' references in the Odes are striking, especially Ode xi, 'Blessed, O Lord, are they who are planted in thy land and who have a place in thy Paradise!'

The injunction of the Odes to 'keep my mystery' (Ode viii. 10) is interpreted by Dr. Bernard as being equivalent to a *Disciplina Arcani*, according to which the initiates into mysteries, whether Christian or non-Christian, were solemnly forbidden to divulge the rites in which they took part. Dr. Bernard has been criticized for this interpretation, as if it were impossible that there could have been any secret about Christian Baptism, concerning which every one was well-informed, and which the early Christians, like Justin Martyr, were not slow to discourse upon. The criticism was not well-founded. It is certain that St. Cyril, at all events, in his opening lecture, put the initiates on their honour in the very language of the Odes. 'If', said he, 'one should ask what the teachers have said, "Tell nothing to a stranger; for we deliver to thee a mystery, even the hope of the life to come; *keep the mystery* for Him who pays thee".' If the language seem somewhat Eleusinian, and Cyril poses as a hierophant, that may very well

Digitized by Google

be the attitude of the Christian teacher in his day; and on this point Dr. Bernard interprets correctly the mind of St. Cyril.

In the very same introductory lecture Cyril describes the benefits of Baptism in glowing language: it is the 'ransom of captives; the remission of offences; the death of sin; the regeneration of the soul; *the garment of light*; the holy *seal* indissoluble; the *chariot* (or perhaps *ship*) to Heaven; *the delight of Paradise* the procuring of the Kingdom; the gift of Sonship'. Special attention should be paid to those italicised terms, which are susceptible of illustration from the Odes.

These illustrations will suffice to show the way in which Cyril's lectures may be used to throw light on the Odes. As we have previously shown, his acquaintance with them must be conceded, and his use of them is demonstrated. He knows them well; they colour his language, and affect his doctrine; and he has employed them in a number of instances in the sacramental as well as the mystical sense.

In the next place, Dr. Bernard shows that there are a number of baptismal hymns extant, and attributed to Ephrem the Syrian, a contemporary of Cyril of Jerusalem, in which there are undoubted traces of the use of the Odes. They appear to have been composed for the festival of the Epiphany, which marks them off as a distinct tradition from the Easter baptisms at Jerusalem upon which Cyril is engaged. Bernard makes a special study of the thirteenth of these Hymns of the Epiphany, and deduces a number of parallels. The matter deserved a closer study.

We have shown in a previous chapter the dependence of Ephrem upon the Odes, and his use of the similitudes that are either borrowed from the Odes or may be brought into connexion with them; and this dependence was not deduced from the Epiphany Hymns: the first passage which we have identified was from Ephrem's *Discourses on Paradise*; in which we detected a quotation from the 11th Ode of Solomon. Again, among the *Hymns on the Church and on Virginity* we found Ephrem carefully re-editing

Digitized by Google

and expanding the 13th Ode of Solomon (the 'mirror' Ode). We were able to establish that he knew the Ode in the form in which we have it:

'Behold, the Lord is our mirror';

and on comparison with the first of the Epiphany Hymns, we found the same Ode employed with this modification:

'The water! its nature is like a mirror.'

So it was clear that Ephrem had in writing the Baptismal Hymns for the Epiphany changed 'the Lord' ܡܪܝܐ into 'the water' ܡܝܐ. If then the Ode in question was originally baptismal, it was now become baptismal in a new and indisputable manner. There can be no doubt about Ephrem's use of the Odes, nor about his power of adapting them to the theme upon which he is working.

The Epiphany Hymns are charged with baptismal allusions, borrowed from the Scriptures and from the Odes of Solomon. The question is at once raised as to whether this exegesis is valid, either in the one case or the other. To take an example, Ephrem says in the seventh of the Epiphany Hymns that Moses appealed to the children of Lot for water (which was to be paid for) and a right of way. He was refused both. But under the New Covenant we have living water gratis and a path that leads to Eden. Obviously Ephrem has read 'water' to mean 'baptism' mystically, and 'the path' to mean the 'way to Paradise'. This is illicit in exegesis, but at least it shows that Ephrem believed that 'baptism' and 'living water' in this connexion were the same thing, and that baptism was the entrance to Paradise, just as Cyril believed it to be.[1] Are we justified in carrying this method of interpretation back to the time of the composition of the Odes? We can easily carry it forward and find later Syriac writers, like Moses Bar Kepha, who will expand and dilate upon the baptismal

[1] Ephrem sometimes uses 'living water' for the grace of God: he says that Judas the traitor drank living water (*Brev. Chald.* ii, p. ܫܐ).

Digitized by Google

language of the Scriptures and of the Odes, but how far back did this manner of teaching prevail? It is full-fledged in Ephrem: was it nascent in the Odes? It is good for the end of the fourth century, did it prevail at the beginning of the second century or the first?

Here is an instance from the very same hymn which is more favourable to Dr. Bernard's view. Ephrem draws a baptismal illustration from the lapping of water by Gideon and his men, and infers that those who go down to the victorious waters will get the victor's crown. Shall we make a parallel with the ninth Ode of Solomon?

'Put on the crown ......
All those who have conquered shall be written in His book,
For their book is victory ....'

Evidently the Ode will not bear the strain of such interpretation. But Ephrem continues:

'Ye baptized take your torches,
Like the torches of the Gideonites:
Conquer the darkness with your torches:
The stillness with your Hosannas.'

This, too, is illicit exegesis, except that for our purposes it is valuable as showing that the newly baptized carried torches in the fourth century and shouted Hosannas: but this is the very thing which has been suggested as an illuminant for the obscurity of Ode xxv. 7:

'Thou didst set me a torch at my right hand and at my left.'

And as the same thing occurred in the mysteries of Isis, why may it not have occurred in an early Christian ritual? To which the answer probably is, What do you mean by early? How early? Do you mean the third century or the first? The time just before the Nicene Council, or the time just following the Council of Jerusalem? It must be admitted that Dr. Bernard has established a number of important coincidences between the Odes and the

Digitized by Google

fourth-century rituals; but almost all his authorities are subsequent, not merely to Apostolic times, but to sub-apostolic writings and to the early apologists. Is not Dr. Bernard reading into the Odes a liturgical evolution of a later period? Or are we wrong in having carried the Odes so far back into primitive times?

Let us look at the matter from another point of view. Suppose we had discovered, instead of a Christian Psalter, some Psalms from the Hebrew Psalter, imagined to have been lost. Would it not have been just as easy to read baptismal allusions into them as into the Odes? The first Psalm, for instance, would make almost as good a parallel for Cyril, with its trees planted by rivers of water, and its leaves that never fade, as is furnished by the first Ode. And the second Psalm, with its adoptionist language ('Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee') actually carried over into the Western text of the Baptism of Jesus, would be almost irrefutable.

Now the supposition that we are making is not an idle one. The first Psalm was actually handled in this way, as being, according to Barnabas, predictive of the 'water and the Cross'. He differs from our odist in the emphasis which he lays upon the 'cross', and agrees with him in the stress laid upon the 'water'. The passage in Barnabas is very suggestive; it runs as follows:

> 'And again he saith in another prophet: *And he that doeth these things shall be as the tree that is planted by the parting streams of waters, which shall yield his fruit at his proper season, and his leaf shall not fall off, and all things whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. Not so are the ungodly, not so, but are as the dust which the wind scattereth from the face of the earth. Therefore ungodly men shall not stand in judgement, neither sinners in the counsel of the righteous, and the way of the ungodly shall perish.* Ye perceive how he pointed out the Cross and the water at the same time. For this is the meaning: Blessed are they that set their hope upon the Cross, and go down into the water; for He speaketh of the reward *at His proper season*; then, saith He, I will repay. But now, what saith He? *His leaves shall not fall off.* He meaneth by this that every word which shall come forth from your

Digitized by Google

mouth in faith and love, shall be for the conversion and hope of many.'

This is a very instructive case of the way the ecclesiastical and allegorical mind finds what it looks for in the Scripture:

'quaerit sua dogmata quisque,
invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.'

If Barnabas can do this on the ancient Psalter, why should not the like be done on the new Psalter, which we have seen to have been at an early date attached to the elder volume, of which, indeed, it is in part a reflexion? We conclude, then, that great caution is necessary before we infer that a book, which has been treated to a baptismal or liturgical exposition, is itself baptismal or liturgical. To complete the proof we shall need some much earlier evidence than Dr. Bernard has brought forward, or we shall have to reduce the evidence for the antiquity of the Odes.

Dr. Bernard, naturally, sees this quite clearly, and goes in search of the early baptismal rituals. With a correct instinct (for his whole work is full of just and felicitous intuitions) he takes the Liturgy of the Church of Antioch, so far as it has been restored from the writings of Severus the patriarch in the sixth century, and from the writings of Chrysostom. In this restored ritual Bernard sees ecclesiastical form and usage which go back to the second century, and he concludes (p. 64) that 'The Liturgy of Antioch is, without doubt, much older than the days of Chrysostom, and it may well have been in existence, in its main features, in the second century. It is even possible that the parallels which have been indicated between the phrases of the Prayer for the Catechumens, and the words of our Odist, show that the writer of the (eighth) Ode composed his poem with these phrases in his mind.'

We have no space to discuss the parallels to which Dr. Bernard refers, which do not seem conclusive: the point which we lay stress on is that, even if we take the Antioch Liturgy back to the second century, in the form which we can trace in the fourth century, or

the sixth, we are still very far from the date to which the investigation in the present volume refers the composition of the Odes. Bernard makes the following judgement as to the time and place of production of the Odes (p. 42):

> 'It is clear that the Odes are of Syrian, or Palestinian origin. The Baptismal allusions which abound are always to beliefs and practices current in the East; with Western ceremonial they have little affinity.'

We agree that the Odes have nothing to do with the Western Church and that they are Syrian or Palestinian in origin.

'They can hardly', said Bernard, 'be later than A.D. 200, and may be some years earlier . . . It is not likely that the baptismal ritual was so fully organized as it appears to be in these Odes, before the days of Justin Martyr. I incline, then, to a date between 150 and 200 for their origin, and *preferably in the latter half of that period*.' We note the admission with regard to the evolution of the baptismal ritual.

There is another direction in which we have found serious difficulty, as we have gone over the ground of this new edition, not without some attraction to Dr. Bernard's position, nor without a sense of admiration at once for the learning which is involved in his material and the skill with which he employs it.

We find that, in a number of directions, the Odes have suffered from a want of adequate knowledge of the theology of the time in which they were composed. It is clear that they belong to a time when the Wisdom-Christology was passing into the Logos-Christology, and had not yet been practically effaced by it. We have shown that a number of the original Sapiential terms are still lying about in the Odes. The 'Mirror' of the 13th Ode is certainly Christ, and Christ as Wisdom. The situation is reflected for us in the Apocryphal Acts of John, where Jesus says:

> 'I am a mirror to them that know me.'

It is the 'unspotted mirror of the Father' in *Sap. Sol.* vii. 26. For

Digitized by Google

this reason alone we are forbidden to take the mirror, as Ephrem and Moses Bar Kepha do, in a baptismal sense, as if it were a water mirror, with the candidate for baptism standing before it like a new Narcissus, to see his old face passing into his new. The same thing is true of the *ἀπόρροια* or Efflux in Ode vi. Here again the *editio princeps* went wrong in its interpretation, following a previous lead of Ryle and James in their book on the *Psalms of Solomon*, in the suggestion that the Ode had to do with the river in Ezekiel. It was a natural conclusion, deduced from the growth of the *ἀπόρροια* or Efflux, from brook to river. The term belongs to Wisdom, and the Efflux is either the Holy Spirit, or, in an experimental sense, the knowledge of the Lord. In favour of the identification with the Sapiential language we may compare what is said in the opening verses, as to the improbability of resisting or standing up against the Lord, with what is said of His Wisdom in *Sap. Solomon*; and the growth of the stream is anticipated in the clause which tells us that the Lord has multiplied His knowledge.[1] This Knowledge is the Divine Wisdom, which is here identified with the Holy Spirit, for the writer says:

> 'Our Spirits praise *His Holy Spirit:*
> For there went forth an *ἀπόρροια*.'

Thus there is no reference at all to baptism: the mysticism of the writer is in a different region; and though he makes his irresistible Wisdom into a stream of water, the author of the *Pistis Sophia* knew that it was really an efflux of Light, a companion term to *ἀπαύγασμα*. This Ode must be removed from the argument; and the parallels which prove that the waters in Ezekiel are baptismal are no longer valid.

[1] That the Efflux 'filled everything' is due, as Tondelli points out, to the prophecy that

> 'The earth shall be full of the Knowledge of the Lord
> As the waters cover the sea.'—Isa. xi. 9.

or we may compare

> πνεῦμα Κυρίου πεπλήρωκε τὴν οἰκουμένην.—*Sap. Sol.* i. 7.

Digitized by Google

One other feature of the Odes deserves some attention. Dr. Bernard agrees with ourselves that in a number of Odes there is a change in the personality of the speakers between the Odist and Christ. It is difficult to mark the exact point at which the prophetic speech becomes 'thus saith the Lord'. A great deal depends on this determination in Dr. Bernard's argument. For instance, in the 26th Ode, Bernard puts the heading

'A song of the baptized Christian.'

We have, on the other hand, come to the conclusion that the

'Luminary, the Son of God'

in verse 3, is Christ Himself, and that the following stanza should be translated:

'I was the most glorified amongst the glorious ones,
And the greatest among the great ones.'

This being so, the being who is brought forth by the Spirit as Mother is Christ. Christ is the anointed of God, and is spoken of (a phrase preserved in the Koran) as one of the Divine Neighbours. The theology of the Ode is not quite settled into orthodox terms and distinctions, but it is not to be taken as deliberately unorthodox. If our view here is right and our translation correct, there is no reference to a baptized and illuminated Christian in the Ode. It becomes increasingly clear that the Odes are not dominated by a single theme, as Dr. Bernard's theory requires.[1] When the various subtractions are made from that theory, which the foregoing arguments require, it does not follow that there is nothing left of the nature of a baptismal allusion. The *editio princeps* and several of the first commentators may have overstated the matter in one direction, just as Dr. Bernard has done in another.

The 'crown', however, is gone, and the 'efflux' and the

[1] Tondelli, to whose excellent study of the Odes we have already referred, says of the theory of a single dominant interpretation (loc. cit., p. 120): 'Non vi potra mai essere una interpretatione unica di cantici tanto variati.'

Digitized by Google

'torches', and the 'coat of skin': perhaps the 'seal' remains, but this 'seal' is also in the Psalter of Solomon, and appears to mean 'a mark of ownership' or 'talisman'.

On the whole, we must conclude that the Odes, taken *en bloc*, are not baptismal hymns, that they have nothing to do with the forty days of Lent, that they do not respond to the tests of a highly evolved ritual; and that such references to baptism as may remain are merely occasional and not structural.

CHAPTER XVII

Harnack and the Odes.

We come now to the explanation of the genesis and structure of the book of the Odes of Solomon, which was put forward by Harnack, and endorsed by Spitta, Diettrich, Grimme, and others, viz. that they are a collection of Jewish Odes, which have passed, as so many other Jewish books, into early Christian hands, and have been the subject of Christian interpolations and corrections. These interpolations Harnack essays to define, and in so doing lays himself at once open to the counter-criticism that what is interpolated is of the same fabric as what is original. The old cloth and the new patch are so exactly of the same material, that one naturally concludes that the coat was not really torn nor mended. In many cases, that is, our closer study has removed the apparent discontinuities in the sequence of the Odes.

According to Harnack, then, the Odes were originally composed by a Jewish mystic, somewhere in the period between 50 B.C. and A.D. 67, and were re-handled by a Christian mystic about the year A.D. 100. This is very nearly the date arrived at by ourselves for the completed volume. The limits of time for the assumed earlier Jewish mystic are defined, (i) by the fact that they are later than the Psalter of Solomon, with which we often find them associated; (ii) by the assumption that the Temple at

Digitized by Google

Jerusalem is still supposed to be standing in the time of the first writer, as is inferred from the language of the fourth Ode, and is an object of his religious affection. On the former of these points there can hardly be a doubt; but the question of the Odist's references to the Temple will require some further study before the obscurities that are attached to it can be said to have disappeared. We may have to admit that the Temple is gone.

Meanwhile it must be said over again that the hypothesis of Harnack has many antecedent objections. The hypothesis of a Christian, or Judaeo-Christian composer, who betrays (at first sight at all events) few of the external signs of Christianity, because of the elevation of his personal experience above the levels of ritual practices and dogmatic definitions, is replaced by Harnack by the hypothesis of a Jewish composer who is as free from definite traces of Judaism as the assumed Christian writer is of the corresponding elements of Christianity. The man who, as far as his language goes, had no Eucharist is replaced by a man without a Passover. The man without a doctrine of Penitence is replaced by a man who has no doctrine of sacrifice and no Day of Atonement. The man who moves so lightly among the early Christian orders as not to refer to a bishop, while apologizing for his own priesthood, and apparently confounding deacons with evangelists, has to be replaced by a Jew who loves the Temple, but has not a word to say of the associated priesthood and ritual! At first sight, as we say, this looks very unlikely, and it is made more so by the necessary deduction that the assumed non-ritualist, undogmatic, mystical Jew suffered interpolation at the hands of an equally non-ritualistic, undogmatic, and mystical Christian! Probability is against the conjunction. The argument may be challenged for either of the two contrasted pictures; for it has been argued that the Christian Odes are coloured by Christian cult, and it is certain that they are saturated by Christian theology, and this modifies one side of the contrasted mysticisms, at least to some extent; while the hypothetical Jew, who occupies the

Digitized by Google

other side, is still a creature of the air, for whom no historical or literary corroboration is yet forthcoming. And whatever may be the personalities dissected out of the authorship of the Odes, the crowning objection will probably be found in the internal unity of the Odes to any theory of interpolation.

Let us now come, for a few moments, to the Temple references.

In the fourth Ode the singer commences with a eulogy on the unchangeable and eternal Holy Place of the Most High, over which human hands have no power.

In the sixth Ode, the river of life (whether it be the Holy Spirit, or the Knowledge of God, or whatever else) comes to the Temple and apparently sweeps it away, and flows out to cover the face of the whole earth. On the first publication of the Odes it was naturally supposed that we had found a historical landmark. The Temple in the sixth Ode is certainly the Jewish temple, whatever happens to it, be the waters friendly or hostile. Assuming that the Temple in the fourth Ode was also the Temple of Solomon, it was argued by Harris that it was probably in recent ruin, and that attempts had been made to build it elsewhere or to find it elsewhere. Harnack, however, while agreeing as to the sympathetic attitude of the Odist, thought the Temple was still standing. To these views there has been a chorus of objection. It was maintained, and with much justice, that the Temple of the fourth Ode, which could not be replaced or displaced, was spiritual and not local, and that it stood either for the Christian believer or for the Christian Church; and if this objection were valid, then the supposed historical landmark had disappeared, at least as far as the fourth Ode is concerned.

If, however, the writer of the fourth Ode is looking away from the Jewish temple in the first verse of the Ode, he is certainly casting sidelong glances at it in the following stanzas. His reference to God's heart, as given to believers, is based upon God's promise to Solomon, at the Temple Dedication, that his 'eyes *and his heart* should be there continually' (2 Chron. vii. 17). And his

Digitized by Google

statement that 'one hour of thy Faith is more precious than all days and years', is an evident adaptation of the language of the 84th Psalm ('a day in thy courts'), a Psalm whose motive of deep affection is expressed in the very first verse, 'How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts: my soul longeth, yea even fainteth for the courts of the Lord'. Clearly we are entitled to say that the Temple at Jerusalem is not out of the field of view of the Odist. May we not go further and say that it is an object of intense affection, not only for its own sake, but because of a disaster that has befallen it? For the Odist who begins with the theme of the spiritually unchangeable Sanctuary, comes in the closing verses to the question whether God may have gone back on His promises to His people, and ends his song with the statement that whatever happened was not only in the Divine foreknowledge, but also that the thing which happened had actually been done by God Himself. We translated the last sentence of the Ode in the sense that

'Thou, O Lord, hast done it all.'

In this point of view, the outward temple has gone: its removal was God's own doing. The Temple was, indeed, Solomon's, but it was Solomon's in the sense indicated by the *Wisdom of Solomon* (ix. 8):

'Thou didst bid me build a temple in thy Holy Mountain:
. . . .
An imitation of the Holy Tabernacle,
Which thou didst prepare from the beginning.'

There is, then, no need to interpret the fourth Ode as anything but a Christian product; and it should have been composed at a later date than A.D. 70.

Turn now to the question of the supposed interpolations: here is Harnack's first list of Christian additions:

iii. 7.
vii. 3b–6, 12, 15.
viii. 22–fin.
ix. 3b.

Digitized by Google

x. 4–fin.
xvii. 10–fin.
xix.
xxiii. 18–fin.
xxiv. 1.
xxvii.
xxix. 6, 7a.
xxxi. 3–fin.
xxxvi. 3, 4.
xxxix. 11.
xli. 1–7, 11a, 11b–fin.
xlii. 1–2 (3–11 partially) 12–fin.

Notice that the 28th Ode is not classed as Christian; we have shown that it is in great part made up out of the 22nd Psalm, and used, as the Christian Fathers generally use it, in an anti-Judaic and Messianic manner. Here is a whole Ode that has been carried off from its proper owner. Try another Ode. Harnack sees that Wisdom occupies an important place in the theology of the Odes (and so does Diettrich); but when Wisdom speaks or is spoken of in the terms of Proverbs viii. 22 ('the Lord possessed me' or 'the Lord created me'), the reference is almost certainly to Christ as the Wisdom of God: all such passages when spoken of a particular person are Christian. Thus in Ode vii, while making liberal excisions, Harnack has left standing the words

'He who created Wisdom',

and

'He who created me'.

The Christology of the sentences may be awkward, but it is real Christology. Or take Ode xxv, in which Harnack finds no Christian insertions; notice the suggestion (it hardly amounted to proof) that we have given elsewhere, that the name of Christ is actually played upon in the closing sentences:

'I became the Lord's by the name of the Lord,' &c.

And in the same way we might continue with other passages and other Odes, and we should end with a feeling of uncertainty, not

Digitized by Google

with regard to the question whether there were any Christian interpolations in the body of the Jewish Odes, but whether we could find any Jewish elements at all in the body of a Christian Psalter. We are willing to reserve a small residual margin for actual Judaism and future examination. It is doubtful if it would be enough to make a historical antecedent out of for the book of Odes. In that sense, then, we put Harnack and Spitta and their colleagues on one side. The position is untenable.

A brilliant but unsuccessful attempt to find a middle ground between Harnack's view that the Odes were Jewish with Christian interpolations, and the view that they were Judaeo-Christian with some later additions, was made by the late Professor Menzies, who suggested that they might be 'Psalms of the Proselytes', i. e. of the Gentiles who were proselytes to Judaism. It is well known that all the great cities of the East had communities of God-Fearers, who had embraced Judaism in its more liberal forms of presentation; and such communities, often numbering amongst themselves persons of social distinction and good education, would easily give rise to literary developments, such as the Odes before us, in which there is a universalism which expresses itself in terms that are either those of a nascent Gentile Church outside Judaism, or an absorbed Gentile constituency within Judaism.

Professor Menzies thought that by an intermediate view that the Odes were the work of Jewish proselytes, it would be possible to explain the presence of Jewish traits in the Odes and the affirmed absence of Christian characteristics. At the same time the unity of the collection was emphasized and established.

It was a brief but suggestive statement of a theory which does not need to be refuted in detail. We do not think that any reader of the present volume is likely to conclude that there is an absence of Christian elements in the Odes, nor that the Christ who is referred to is simply the expectation of Judaism. There is too large a volume of Christology to be carried on the back of proselytes to Judaism.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVIII

Gnosticism in the Odes.

As it has been affirmed in several quarters, and particularly by Gunkel, that the Odes are a Gnostic product, and as Preuschen has put forward a more definite charge than that of Gnosticism, and promises to show that they are due to the arch-Gnostic Valentinus, it may be as well to devote a little space to the consideration of this theme. In one respect the course of the argument that sustains the hypothesis is not unlike that of Dr. Bernard: one searches for parallels to the Odes in Gnostic writers, just as Dr. Bernard searches for them in liturgies, and then the conclusion is drawn that the Odes have a Gnostic origin in the one case, or a liturgical ancestry in the other. It is not difficult to find a certain amount of coincidence between such Gnostic writers as are known to us and the Odes. The very fact that such stress is laid on the place of Knowledge by the Odist as a factor in redemption invites the parallel with Gnosticism, and distinct and personal allusions may be traced—or imagined.

Valentinus, for example, was not so far from the Kingdom of God, or from St. John as its exponent, that he could not claim a share in the Johannine parallels which the Odes afford; and if the third Ode of the series is found to contain a sentence which re-echoes the Johannine doctrine that 'we love, because He first loved us', Valentinus also taught that 'God the Father was all love, but love is not love where there is no object of love. So the Father begat two emanations, *νοῦς* and *ἀλήθεια*.' And the claims made on behalf of Valentinus may be reinforced by the fact that the Bardesanian school, amongst whom we have found traces of the Odes, is known to have been under his influence. We suspect, however, that just as in the baptismal passages, where such may be established, there is a tendency to make the first last and the last first. As far as our inquiry has gone, the Odes

Digitized by Google

vindicate their antiquity against any Gnostic School of which we have clear knowledge. A good example is the *Coat of Skin*, which the Odist casts off when he becomes a believer. This shedding of the old Adam has a very distinct commentary supplied by the ritual and liturgies of baptism; but it also became a highly developed Gnostic product amongst Bardesanians and Manichees, as we know from Ephrem. Is it necessary to put a special label on the Odist, because he has supplied material to the Church ritual or the heretic speculations?

There is, in the Odes, what looks very like a *Virgin of Light*, such as might serve again for the speculative mind, in Edessa and farther East; and Ephrem takes his opportunity to rail at the lady: but she is orthodox enough in times when the Church was regarded either as a Virgin or as a Mother, or, perhaps, as both. And since she is really, as the poet Spenser says, 'Sapience, that sits in the bosom of the Deity', there is no need artificially to Gnosticize her.

If in any special cases we do find a good Gnostic parallel we must examine it carefully and see what it involves. The Gnostics have as good a right to use the Odes as they have to the rest of the Scriptures (Irenaeus will say they have none at all: then they have as little a right to the use of the Odes as to the rest of the Scriptures). Stölten's attempts to find such parallels are a great failure: even the *Pistis Sophia* is brought in to swell the tale, as if the *Pistis* were not itself quoting the Odes! There are, however, one or two cases where parallel is suggestive and might lead to a recognition of an actual acquaintance. For example, there is the case of Marcus the Gnostic, Irenaeus's *bête noire*, who harried the flock of Christ in Pothinus's day, and provoked the good man into iambic verse. He (Marcus) tells us that 'the dissolution of ignorance is the knowledge of the Father', which is very like a verse in the seventh Ode of Solomon (Ode vii. 21). If he quoted the Ode, we have one more early second-century authority for the existence of the collection, but no authority for

Digitized by Google

making a Gnostic out of the Odist. The same is true if it is an independent parallel. It may be readily conceded that Knowledge and Love have more place in the Odes than Penitence and Confession; but that does not make them Gnostic products: at the worst they are only suggestive of possible and later developments.

We do not think there is any case, at present, for pressing the claims of the Gnostics to the authorship of the Odes. Valentinus himself is not early enough; and we do not think any one is going to claim these lovely songs of the Spirit for Cerdo, or Cerinthus, or Simon Magus.

In passing we may say that Dr. Conybeare's suggestion that the Odes are Montanist is also out of court, on the ground both of date and locality; we do not wish to imply that Montanism is a heresy: if the Montanists knew the Odes they would have found them congenial and sung them in good faith, perhaps in contrasted choirs, Priscilla leading on one side, and Maximilla on the other: but they can hardly have composed them.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

ODES OF SOLOMON

ODE I

1 The Lord is upon my head like a crown; — Cf. *Sap. Sol.* xviii. 24 and *Acta Thomae*, p. ܩܟܗ.
And I shall not be without Him.

2 The crown of truth was woven for me;
And it caused thy branches to bud in me;

3 For it is not like a withered crown that buddeth not: — Ps. i. 3; cf. 1 Pet. v. 4.

4 But thou livest upon my head;
And thou hast blossomed upon my head:

5 Thy fruits are full-grown and perfect;
They are full of thy salvation.
(Hallelujah.)

Expository Notes.

This Ode is not found in the Syriac MS. which is imperfect at the beginning: it has been recovered from the Coptic text, where it is introduced in the following manner:

> 'Mary, the mother of Jesus, answered and said: My Lord, these are the words in which your Power of Light prophesied aforetime through Solomon in his nineteenth Ode, and said: The Lord,' &c.

This must, then, be one of the two missing Odes at the beginning of the collection; and it is a natural suggestion that it was numbered as the nineteenth, because the collection of Psalms of Solomon, eighteen in number, preceded the Odes. This is, therefore, the missing first Ode.

We may call it, if we please, a Coronation Ode; it represents some great experience in the spiritual life of the writer, who has been crowned

Digitized by Google

or garlanded with God in the form of Truth. The same figure recurs in Ode v. 12 in very similar language:

'He (the Lord) is as a garland upon my head,
And I shall not be moved:
Even if everything should be moved,
I stand firm.'

We have it also in Ode ix. 8, 9:

'A crown eternal is the Truth,
Blessed are they who put it on their heads.
. . . .
There's a battle to fight ere the crown be attained.'

Again, in Ode xvii. 1, 2:

'I was crowned by my God:
And my crown is living.
And I was justified by my Lord:
My salvation is incorruptible.'

Also in Ode xx. 7, 8:

'Put on the grace of the Lord without stint:
And come into His Paradise and make thee a garland from His tree,
And put it on thy head and be glad.'

It is reasonable to interpret all these passages in a similar way. Various lines of thought suggest themselves for the further elucidation of the crown: the first is that it is the same crown or wreath that is spoken of in the New Testament: here in two places we have an allusion to a lost saying of Jesus:

'The Crown of Life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.'—James i. 12.

'Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee the Crown of Life.'—Apoc. ii. 10;

in both of which cases the crown is the victor's reward after trial; the victor being at the same time thought of as a lover. In the Epistle of James the matter is introduced by a reference to the man who endures trial (πειρασμόν), stands the test (δόκιμος γενόμενος), and accordingly receives the crown; in the Apocalypse, the Church at Smyrna is warned of the impending trial; the devil is going to cast some of them into prison, that they may be tested (πειρασθῆτε): so they must be faithful till death.

Digitized by Google

It is natural to interpret the crown in these cases as the Victor's Crown.

In 1 Peter v. 4, we have the 'unfading crown of glory' promised to the faithful pastors of the Church; the blessing is here particular and not general, as is indeed the case with the crowns or garlands of the faithful Smyrneans, but it may be regarded with the former instances as a crown or reward at the end of a faithful life or a prolonged struggle: in other words, the crown is prospective. The same thing is true in the Pastoral Epistles, where a man gets his crown by a properly fought conflict (he will not get it unless he fights fair and unless he wins through, 2 Tim. ii. 5), by finishing the course and by keeping the faith, in which case there is reserved for him the garland of righteousness (2 Tim. iv. 8). The New Testament doctrine of the Crown is, therefore, consistently prospective.

On the other hand, in the Odes, the experience is in the language and terms of the present (or even of the past) rather than the future. The crown appears to be the same as Peter's, one that does not fade away, and the same as in James and John, in that it is a living crown and a lover's crown; but the writer already has his amaranth on his head. It is the same crown of victory, but the Odist suggests that in some sense the battle is over: for instance, in the ninth Ode, to which we were referring just now, with the injunction to 'put on the crown in the true covenant of the Lord', we are told that it is the believer's by right:

10 'Righteousness hath taken it, and hath given it to you:
11 All those who have conquered shall be booked in his book.'

Here the crown is again a crown of righteousness, a reward of victory, apparently regarded as an attainment in the present life. In one case, indeed, the Odist appears to regard his crown retrospectively, as in the 17th Ode, with its living crown that is parallel to the divine justification: ('I was crowned by my God, &c.'). The difference, then, between the crown in the Odes and the crown in the New Testament is a difference of time and attitude: otherwise the language shows that the crown spoken of is the same.

The New Testament parallels, then, suggest that the crown is a *Corona Militis*, a wreath of victory, present or prospective. The question,

Digitized by Google

however, arises whether there may not be other directions of explaining the symbolical language of the Odist, beside the military conception which prevails in the New Testament. Roughly speaking, there are four directions of coronation possible:

(i) The *Corona Militis* already referred to.

(ii) The garland of the person initiated into the Greek Mystery Religions.

(iii) The garland of the newly married.

(iv) The garland of the newly baptised.

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish whether a crown referred to should be classified under the first or second head. For instance, in the rites of Mithras, the worshipper, when he is introduced to the degree of *miles* has a crown offered to him, which he repels, saying in language not unlike that of the Odes, that 'Mithras is my Crown'.[1] Is that any other than a soldier's wreath? In the mysteries of Isis, as Tondelli points out,[2] the initiate is decorated with a garland of palm, and clad in a robe of heaven; he stands with a burning torch in his hand, and is honoured as an apotheosis of the Sun-god.[3]

The description, as we shall see, has remarkable parallels with the Christian initiation, and we can hardly avoid the conclusion that the neophytes of one religion have borrowed from the customs of the other: the Christian religion has been coloured from the Greek Mysteries. We must examine whether the references to the Crown in our Odes are due to an imitation of the Greek mysteries. Is it a real crown that the writer is speaking of, used as a symbol of spiritual truth and experience, or is it, as in the New Testament, a mere figure of speech?

The two other directions in which coronation may be looked for are the marriage and baptismal rites. There is much to suggest marriage symbolism in the Odes. Some persons have not unnaturally found the crown in the Canticles ascribed to King Solomon:[4]

> 'The crown wherewith his mother crowned him in the day of his espousals'—Cant. iii. 11.

[1] Cumont, *Monuments*, i. 318.

[2] *Le Odi*, p. 137.

[3] Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, p. 29.

[4] So Batiffol in *Revue Biblique* for Jan. 1911, p. 36.

Digitized by Google

In that case, the speaker in the opening Ode (and wherever the crown is referred to), is Solomon himself or some one posing as Solomon: but this explanation is, at first sight, somewhat unnatural; moreover, some one may object that we do not even know for certain that the ascription of the Odes to Solomon is primitive. The crown, in the first Ode, if it is a nuptial crown, is the bride's crown. Any one who has taken part in a Greek or Oriental marriage ceremony, will know that an actual coronation is an essential part of it: for that reason, the hypothesis of the nuptial crown is not to be excluded. In the West Syrian rite the officiating priest says:

'A crown is in thy hands, O Lord:
And it descends from heaven . . . .
On the head of the married pair.'

It cannot be denied that the language of the Odes is amatory. Take, for example, the third Ode; here Christ is the Beloved, the believer is the Lover; they have been joined together and their natures mingled (as was said in the *editio princeps*), like water mingled with wine. When that sentence was written, it had not been noticed that the illustration was one of those that are employed by the Sufis: and indeed, it would be easy to describe the whole of the third Ode as a Sufi product. It is high mystic. Compare the following rendering by Hastings of one of the Songs of Jalāl-ud-Dīn Rūmi:

'With thy sweet soul this soul of mine
Hath mixed as water doth with wine.
Who can the Wine and Water part
Or me and thee when we combine?
Thou art become my greater self;
Small bands no more can me confine,
Thou hast my being taken on,
And shall not I now take on thine?'

Whatever Jalāl-ud-Dīn may have meant by his dangerously pantheistic language, the Odes of Solomon go a long way towards him. We may compare further Ode vii. 4:

'He became like me that I might receive Him:
Like myself was He reckoned that I might put Him on.'

As we have said, this is genuine mysticism, the language of the Inward and Upward life. The Christianity involved is experimental and it is

Digitized by Google

ecstatic. It is not impossible, then, that the reference to the Crown might be borrowed from nuptial rites, interpreted mystically.

The objection to this point of view is that it does not cover all the passages referred to, and that it appears to take us further from the New Testament than any of the alternative explanations.

Fortunately, we are able to detect a remarkable confirmation of this view, which almost settles the question of interpretation for us. We have shown that this first Ode is imitated in the hymn which Judas Thomas sings at the royal wedding-feast, where he definitely sets the espousals of the Church over against the nuptials that were proceeding in the palace. There can be no doubt as to the origin or interpretation of a hymn which begins: (*Acts of Thomas*, p. ܩܚܘ),

> 'My Church is the daughter of light,
> On her head dwelleth the King:
> Who feeds all His inhabitants below:
> Truth is placed on her head.'

It is clear, then, that the Ode was understood to be an epithalamium in the earliest days of the Christian Church in Syria.

The Syriac hymn quotes also from another famous epithalamium, the 45th Psalm, in which the nuptials of Solomon are supposed to be described, e. g.

> 'Her garments are like unto flowers:
> The smell whereof is fragrant and pleasant;'

which is an imitation of 'All thy garments smell of myrrh, and aloes and stacte'. We take it that he made his nuptial song out of existing epithalamia; we see that the crown is a bridal crown.

The fourth explanation is that of Diettrich and Bernard and others, who maintain that the reference is to the baptismal circlet, which is still in use in the East: indeed, according to Bernard, the whole of the Odes are Baptismal Hymns, and they are meant to cover the period of instruction of catechumens, who are preparing for the Easter Baptisms in the Early Church. We have said that these baptismal circlets are still in use: one of the editors of this volume has, in fact, baptized more than a hundred children in this way; and there is no doubt that it is a part of the ancient Syrian rule before the introduction of infant baptism, as well as among the Armenians, Copts, and Abyssinians. So the question is raised whether

Digitized by Google

these baptismal customs can be referred to a sufficiently early date, or the time of the composition of the Odes to a sufficiently late date, to admit of an interpretation of the language of the Odes in terms of primitive Christian ritual.[1] The problems referred to have been discussed in the Introduction to this volume, and the arguments *pro* and *con* need not be repeated here. It seems clear that if any one of the garland-Odes is baptismal, the rest may properly be assigned to the same category: for in this regard, Odes i, v, ix, xvii, and xx belong together, and we find a common interpretation for their common language.

In Ode ix. 8, 9, the crown is taken from the 21st[2] Psalm, probably from the Greek Bible, as may be seen from a reference to our note at that point. The allusion is important for the question of the linguistic origin of the Odes, but it is also to be noted that it is the *royal* crown that is spoken of in the Psalm: ('The King shall rejoice in thy salvation, &c.'). Is this Psalm used baptismally? It is certainly a favourite with the Odist, who quotes it again (Ps. xxi. 11 = Ode v. 8) in the fifth Ode, where again we have reference to the crown in verse 12. This should naturally be taken as another loan from the same Psalm.

A remarkable series of parallels to this Ode are pointed out by Bernard in the *Procatechism* of Cyril of Jerusalem: e. g.

> 'Already ye (catechumens) are gathering the spiritual *blossoms* for the *weaving* of heavenly *crowns*, ... for there have now appeared *blossoms* on the trees; may the *fruit* also be *perfect*.'

Here is one which looks in the same direction from the Hymns of Ephrem for the Epiphany Festival:

> 'Beautiful are your garments:
> Splendid your crowns:
> Which the First-Born has *woven for you*:
> . . . .
> *Crowns which do not wither*
> Have been *set on your heads*.'—(ed. Lamy, i. p. 111.)

Does not Ephrem here also take over the language of the first Ode and

[1] Diettrich has shown that the oldest Nestorian Baptismal Liturgies knew nothing of the crowns, which do not come into the written rituals before the seventh century. See *Nest. Taufliturgie*, pp. 49, 87.

[2] Ps. xxi. 3 (= xx. 3 in the Greek version).

Digitized by Google

not merely illustrate it: the reference to the 'weaving for you' a crown is very like the language of the Odist.

In that case Ephrem has interpreted the language of the Ode baptismally, as he did with everything that he could lay his hands on in the Old Testament.

Two other points of interest come up in connexion with this first Ode. One is the question as to the origin of the expression about 'the full and perfect fruits of God' at the close of the hymn. The other is a suggestion that a line, or perhaps a couple of lines, has been dropped at the end of the Ode, and wrongly restored. We are in the region of speculation, but not, we hope, aberrant or wanton speculation.

First with regard to the full and perfect fruits. To explain these, we start from the position that the Odist has been imitating in some of his lines the first Psalm in the canonical Psalter. The unfading leaves of his crown are reminiscent of

'His leaf also shall not wither,
And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.'

We suggested that he has understood the second line of the couplet to refer to the tree, and not to the man who is likened to a tree. That is to say, 'doeth' (עֹשֶׂה) means 'produceth'; (it is, in fact, the ordinary word for bringing forth fruit, and finds its equivalent in the New Testament as ποιῶν καρπούς). In what sense is the word to be understood that

'All the fruit it produces is prosperous.'

The answer is that the fruit is *full* and *perfect*.

Now turn to the Targum on the Psalms. We find that the Targumist takes this very view. For him, also, it is the tree that prospers, and not the man; and he explains that it means,

'Every seed-germ germinates and prospers.'

This is a striking and unexpected confirmation of our suggestion. Moreover, when we turn to the Peshiṭta version of the Psalms, we find a curious reminiscence of or parallel to the 'perfect' fruits of the Ode. Here we find

ܘܟܠ ܕܥܒܕ ܡܫܠܡ

'And all that he does (*or* makes) he perfects (*or* is perfected).'

Here again it is quite possible that the translator interpreted the prosperity to belong to the tree; but the vocalizers have referred it to the man.

This, then, is our tentative explanation of the closing sentences of the Ode. It is an interpretation of the first Psalm.

Now with regard to the stray verse. In Ode iv the sequence of the Hymn is broken by the insertion of the fourth verse:

> 3 'Thou hast given thy heart, O Lord, *to thy faithful*:
> 4 [never wilt thou be barren (idle) nor be unfruitful]:
> 5 For a single hour of *thy faith*
> Is better than all days and years.'

Suppose we remove the intrusive matter (so as to restore the sequence in the fourth Ode) and put it at the end of the first Ode.

> 'Thou livest upon my head,
> And thou hast blossomed upon my head:
> Never wilt thou be barren nor unfruitful:
> Thy fruits are full and perfect:
> Full of thy salvation.'

We suggest, then, that the verse has dropped out of the first Ode, and having been written on the margin has been wrongly restored to the fourth Ode.

ODE II

This Ode is missing.

ODE III

1 . . . . I clothe (them) with:

2 And (His) members are with Him,
And on them do I hang; and He loves me.

3 For I should not have known how to love the Lord, Cf. 1 John iv. 19.
If He had not loved me.

4 For who is able to distinguish love,
Except one that is loved?

Digitized by Google

Cf. John xiv. 3.

5 I love the Beloved, and my soul loves Him.
And where His rest is, there also am I.

Cf. Eph. ii. 19.

6 And I shall be no stranger (there);
For with the Lord Most High and Merciful, there is no grudging.

7 I have been united (to Him), for the lover has found the Beloved:
In order that I may love Him that is the Son, I shall become a son.

Cf. 1 Cor. 6, 17 and John xiv. 19.

8 For he that is joined to Him that is immortal,
Will himself also become immortal.

9 And He that hath pleasure in the Living One,
Will become living.

Cf. Titus i. 2.

10 This is the Spirit of the Lord, which doth not lie,
Which teacheth the sons of men to know His ways.

11 Be wise and understanding and vigilant.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 2. Labourt proposes to change ܘܥܠܝܗܘܢ 'on them' into ܘܥܠܘܗܝ 'on him'.

v. 5. Labourt suggests unnecessarily ܢܝܫܗ 'his sign' for ܢܝܚܗ 'his rest'. See, however,

ܝܕܥܘ ܢܡܘܣܟ ܘܠܐ ܪܓܘ ܢܝܚܟ܀

'They knew thy law and they refused thy rest.'

Ephrem iii. 454, *R. E.*

v. 7. The word ܐܬܚܠܛܬ 'I was mixed up', and by extension possibly 'I was united', is of doubtful meaning.

Digitized by Google

The verb is used also in an absolute manner by Ephrem, without any complement, and its meaning cannot be clearly established:

ܘܐܢܗܘ ܕܐܬܡܙܓܬ ܚܫܒܝܢܟ ܕܢܟܠܐ

'And if thou joinest, they will count thee as a deceiver.'—ii. 468, *R. E.* In this verse of the Odes there is reason to believe that it has the notion of mixture, union, and participation.

In the next line, the translation is given by eliminating the dālath before ܕܐܗܘܐ, as we have suggested to be probable. In maintaining the reading of the MS. we could translate 'Because I shall love that Son, in order that I may be son (myself)'.

v. 9. The MS. has the siamē-points over the word ܚܝܐ *living*, which implies that the word is to be understood in the sense of 'life'. The copyist's punctuation seems, however, not to be well adapted to parallelism with the preceding verse. To call the Christ 'the living one' is one of the characteristics of the Syrian Church, e.g. 'O Living One, who went down to the abode of the dead' (*Breviar. Chald.* ii. p. ܩܢܗ). Cf. *Acta Thomae*, p. 235, and see also Ephrem iii. pp. 33, 135, 149 (*R. E.*). On the other hand, in view of some other passages of the Odes (cf. xxviii. 6, &c.) it would be wiser not to take the above view as irrefragable, and it is even possible that the reading of the MS. may be right.

v. 10. The *dālath* before ܡܟܣܐ is quite correct (against Frankenberg).

Expository Notes.

The scope of this Ode as a genuine mystical product has been pointed out in the notes to the previous Ode. In verse 2, there is confusion in the MS. between 'my members' and 'His members'. As it is not easy to see how a person can hang on his own members, we have adopted the second reading. In that case, we have a Pauline reminiscence in 1 Cor. vi. 15, &c.

In verse 7 the translation proposed by Flemming, 'For the Lover has found the Beloved' has been accepted, although it interferes somewhat with the parallelism of the verses, which seem to require us to take ܡܚܒ ܕ in the same sense in successive stanzas. We have suggested as an alternative to read 'that I may be found a lover to the Beloved'. After the words 'I have been united (*or* 'mingled'), the necessary expletive ܗܘ

Digitized by Google

has been added in the translation. We may compare *Acta Thomae* (ed Wright, p. ܪܠܐ) 'that with thy humanity he might be mingled (or united)'.

In verse 9 the ancient name of Jesus, 'the Living One', has been restored as has been done in the Revised Version of Apoc. i. 17 ('The First and the Last and the Living One'). For another example we may take *Acta Thomae* (p. ܪܠܗ). '*Thou art the Living One, the Son of the Living One.*' Note that the expression can be traced again in Ode viii. 22. if we translate the verse

'Ye who are kept abide in *Him that liveth*,'

the Living One referred to being clearly Christ.

The strongly Johannine cast of the Ode will have been noted. The Ode is a hymn written on the theme, 'We love Him because He first loved us' (1 John iv. 19), with perhaps a reference also to the doctrine that 'he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit' (1 Cor. vi. 17). Whether we are to recognize actual quotations or distinct references depends on the general decision as to the priority of the Odes to the Fourth Gospel and the Pauline Epistles, or the contrary. These questions are discussed in the Introduction.

The whole Ode, like the first Ode, is of the nature of an epithalamium. Bacon described it rightly (*Harvard Theol. Rev.* for 1916, p. 382) as 'a song in the vein of Canticles'.

ODE IV

1 No man, O my God, changeth thy holy place;
Nor is (one able) to change it, and put it in another place.

2a Because he hath no power over it;
2b For thy sanctuary Thou designedst before thou didst make places:

3a That which is the elder shall not be changed by those that are younger than itself:
Cf. 2 Chron. vii. 16. 3b Thou hast given thy heart, O Lord, to thy believers.

Digitized by Google

4 Thou wilt never fail,
Nor wilt Thou be without fruits:

5 For one hour of thy Faith Cf. Ps. lxxxiv. 10.
Is more precious than all days and years.

6 For who is there that shall put on thy grace, and be injured?

7 For thy seal is known:
And thy creatures are known to it.

8 And the hosts possess it:
And the elect archangels are clad with it.

9 Thou hast given us thy fellowship:
It was not that thou wast in need of us;
But that we are in need of thee.

10 Distil[1] thy dews upon us;
And open thy rich fountains that pour forth to us milk and honey.

11 For there is no repentance with thee: Cf. Rom. xi. 29 and Num. xxiii. 19.
That thou shouldest repent of anything that thou hast promised.

12 And the end was known[2] to thee:

13 For what thou gavest, thou gavest freely:
So that thou mayest not draw back and take them again.

14 For all was known to thee as God;
And set in order from the beginning before thee:

15 And thou, O Lord, hast made[3] all things.
Hallelujah.

[1] *Lit.* bedew. [2] *Lit.* revealed. [3] *Or*, done.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 1. Grammatically, it is more natural that the Syriac sentence should mean 'No one changeth thy place, my holy God', which paralleled with the second member of verse 2 would give, 'Because Thou designedst thy holiness before Thou madest places'.

The linguistic construction of the second member of this verse as compared with the first seems somewhat strange. This syntactic anomaly is sometimes found in Syriac, e. g.

ܡܫܟܚ ܠܡܪܚܡ ܘܠܡܒܪܟܘ ܘܠܡܐܡܪ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܘܨܠܐ ܕܫܦܝܪ

'He can love, bless, speak the truth, and pray well.'

Spic. Syr. 5 (Cureton).

To make the sentence run more fluently we have suggested ܡܫܟܚ ܕܢܫܚܠܦ in the first member; even the simple addition of ܡܨܐ or ܡܫܟܚ will suffice.

v. 3. Barth proposes ܩܕܝܫܐ 'the holy' for ܥܬܝܩܐ 'the old'. On this hypothesis the note on verse 1 to the effect that the Syriac sentence means also 'my holy God' would be confirmed. In adopting this interpretation the adjective ܙܥܘܪܝܢ which we have translated by 'younger' would have the natural meaning of 'lower, inferior, less perfect', because, linguistically, it seldom has the meaning of 'younger'. In Ephrem the word ܩܕܝܫܐ is frequently used as a title for God, and as a substitute for 'the Lord'. Here is a sentence in which both the 'Sanctuary' and the 'Holy One' are involved:

ܒܗܬܬܐ ܕܚܘܝܘ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܝܟܠܗ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ

'The shamefulness which they exhibited towards the temple of the Holy.'

Ephrem (ed. Mitchell, p. 128).

The Syriac of the Ode may also be rendered, 'He who is the elder shall not be changed by those who are inferior to himself'. And instead of the future tense, the optative form may be adopted: 'Let that which (*or*, the one who) is elder not be changed by those who are inferior to Himself (*or*, itself).

In the next line Gressmann's suggestion of ܓܒܟ 'thy side' for ܠܒܟ 'thy heart' is not necessary.

Digitized by Google

v. 4. The language is nearly the same as that used to describe Paradise in Ode xi. 23. We might, therefore, translate

'Never wilt thou be idle (*or* inoperative).'

v. 6. Grimme's suggestion of ܕܡܥܬܐ for ܘܡܥܬܐ is possible but not necessary.

v. 7. The MS. has ܘܝܕܝܥܝܢ 'are known to' for which we have suggested ܘܝܕܥܝܢ '(thy creatures) know'. This is, perhaps, a daring emendation, since the translation of the text as it stands, 'And thy creatures are known to it', i. e. 'and it knows thy creatures', is sufficiently clear.

v. 8. The MS. does not warrant ܘܚܝܠܘܬܟ 'and thy hosts' printed in the text; it is more probably ܘܚܝܠܘܬܐ 'and the hosts'. Cf. Ode xvi. 14. In the second member of the verse the word ܗܘܘ which the text gives between parentheses is unwarranted by the MS., and is useless. Instead of ܠܒܝܫܝܢ ܠܗ 'are clad with it', Connolly suggests ܠܒܝܟܝܢ 'hold it', which is plausible.

v. 13. ܐܬܠܘܦ of the MS. probably stands for ܐܬܠܘܢ. Frankenberg's derivation of the word from ܝܠܦ is improbable. Barth unnecessarily suggests the eliminating of the *waw* before ܬܫܒ. The objective pronoun ܐܢܝܢ is used by Synesis for ܘܬܫܒܚܬܗܘܢ, the subject being ܘܥܕܝܢ.

Expository Notes.

This Ode is the most important in the whole collection on account of the historical detail with which it appears to commence. The natural explanation would be that there had been some attempt to deny the sanctity of the Temple at Jerusalem, or to transfer that sanctuary to some other spot. The writer resists any such attempts as impious, and is quite sure that they are outside the sphere of human power: for God cannot contradict or withdraw His promises. His promises are His predestination. The Sanctuary was designed from the beginning and known to the Lord from the first. Whatever may have happened in apparent contradiction of God's promises regarding His continual dwelling in the Sanctuary, is itself to be regarded as a part of God's design, and the writer concludes His song by saying that 'God has done it all'.

The sanctuary itself has right of prescription against all other sanctuaries.

Digitized by Google

It is a pre-existent creation. The proof of this is on the Jewish side in *Pirqe Aboth*, vi. 10:

> 'Five possessions possessed the Holy One, blessed is He, in this world; and these are they: Thorah, one possession; Heaven and earth, one possession; Abraham, one possession; Israel, one possession; *the Sanctuary, one possession* . . . the Sanctuary, whence is it proved? Because it is written, *The place*, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in; *the Sanctuary*, O Lord, which thy hands have established (Exod. xv. 17); and it saith, and He brought them to the border of His sanctuary, and even to this mountain which His right hand *has possessed*.'—Ps. lxxviii. 54.

To these proofs, which the Rabbinical writers give, might be added a reference to Psalm lxxiii. (lxxiv.) 2, 'Remember thy congregation which thou hast purchased of old . . . . This is Mount Zion, wherein thou hast dwelt' (cf. LXX ἧς ἐκτήσω ἀπ' ἀρχῆς)

The situation in this Psalm is exactly similar to that which occurred at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. The sanctuary is in ruins and burned by fire; and the similarity of the former and the latter desolations (which the Jews recognized to be even a similarity of date) provoked a similarity of prayer and complaint. Hence the earliest Psalmist entreats the Lord 'not to withdraw His hand' (Ps. lxxiii. 11) and to 'have respect unto His covenant' (v. 20). The later writer says, 'Do not withdraw thy gifts nor repent of thy promises'. Thus the Temple as the outward dwelling-place of God and the symbol of His covenant, is before the mind of the Odist, as it was before the Psalmist.

It is clear that the Temple in the Ode is a real temple, with which the Odist is in a sympathetic relation. Neither here, nor in the language of the sixth Ode, where the Temple is spoken of, have we any right to explain it away. The actual Temple is necessary in the explanation of the fifth verse:

> 'Thou hast given thy heart, O Lord, to thy believers,'

where a reference to God's message and promise to *Solomon* that

> 'My eyes and heart shall be there continually.' (2 Chron. vii. 16.)

removes the apparent discontinuity of the Ode, and relieves us of the resort to interpolation which Harnack suggests.

In the fifth verse one could not miss the reference to Psalm lxxxiv. 10,

Digitized by Google

where 'A day in thy courts' is imitated by the Odist into 'An hour of thy faith superior to all days and years'. The reference ought not to be made without observing that the Psalm imitated (the 84th Psalm) is from the beginning a Temple Psalm; and that the opening sentence, 'How amiable are thy tabernacles' would acquire a sorrowful and a poignant meaning in the time of a national disaster. We shall probably, then, be safe in placing the writer within sight of Jerusalem, and of Jerusalem in ruins. The Scriptural references which lie behind our Odes are references to the actual temple at Jerusalem, the *Salomonic* temple. Just as in Ode vi, where the mighty stream that overflows everything has for its goal the actual Temple, we cannot start with allegory: the actual Temple must be there in the first instance, and it was natural enough that the Salomonic Odes should contain reference to the Salomonic building, especially in the time when the foremost thought in many religious minds was the question, what has become of the Temple, or what is going to become of it.

This state of mind which, in our view, has a chronological element in it, is quite consistent with a spiritual interpretation, either on the part of a pious Jew, that the real Temple is the ideal, heavenly structure, or the interpretation of the Christian that it is the Church.[1]

Returning to our Ode, we see that a series of fresh questions is raised in verses 6–10: what is meant by the grace, the seal, the fellowship, the dew, the milk and honey? We seem here to be in another region of thought quite away from the question of the mutability of the Temple service. Two solutions have been offered for the apparent discontinuity: one is Harnack's, that the Ode is a Jewish one interpolated by a Christian hand; the other is that of Bernard that the Ode must be interpreted in the light of the ritual of baptism. We have discussed these views in our Introduction, and the trend of our investigation is in favour of the belief that the Odes are Christian throughout and have not been interpolated. Whether they are baptismal to the extent that has been suggested appears to us to be, at least, doubtful. For instance, in the verses to which we were referring, it is difficult to see the sense in which an early Christian writer could speak of the heavenly hosts as possessing the baptismal sign,

[1] To take a single reference, Zahn says (p. 753): 'Dadurch wird klar, dass er nicht an ein von Menschenhänden bereitetes Gotteshaus mit Vorhöfen und Altären denkt, wie der alte Psalmist, sondern an ein geistliches Haus.'

Digitized by Google

or the angels as being clad with baptismal grace. There is, however, some slight evidence for such a belief, and Dr. Bernard has under-estimated it. Not only have we the testimony of Clement of Alexandria that Theodotus the Gnostic taught that 'the angels were baptized at the beginning into the redemption of the name of Him that came down in the Dove upon Jesus and redeemed Him'[1] (and this evidence of a gnostic interpretation does not exclude a correspondingly Christian thought), but we have the still more surprising belief in Jewish circles that the angels were circumcised, and every Patristic student knows, and our Odes themselves may be in evidence upon the point, how keen the early Christians were to carry over the ideas attaching to circumcision and re-translate them into the language of the New Faith. It is not, then, impossible, that a Christian writer should have restated the Jewish belief concerning angels in a Christian form.

The Jewish belief is found in the *Book of Jubilees*, c. 15, as follows:

> 'And every one that is born, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circumcised on the eighth day, belongs not to the children of the Covenant which the Lord made with Abraham, but to the children of destruction; nor is there, moreover, *any sign on him that he is the Lord's*, but (he is destined) to be destroyed and slain from the earth, and to be rooted out of the earth, for he has broken the covenant of the Lord our God. For all the angels of the presence and all the angels of the sanctification have been so created from the day of their creation, and before the angels of the presence and the angels of sanctification He hath sanctified Israel, that they should be with Him *and with His holy angels*.'

Here, then, the angels are represented as circumcised. Dr. Charles does not suggest the reason for this belief, nor point out its polemical necessity; but in a foot-note he adds the important observation that 'our book knows nothing of the later traditions that the patriarchs such as Adam, Seth, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Terah, Jacob, and six others were born circumcised'. The reference is important, because it takes us into the region of polemic. Every Patristic student knows that one of the points of attack of the early anti-Judaic writers was precisely this question of the uncircumcised righteous of the days before Abraham. And the obvious reply of the controversialist Jew on the opposite side was to say that the patriarchs were really

[1] Clem. Alex. *Exc. ex Theod.* 22.

Digitized by Google

circumcised. Why is it not mentioned? The answer is that they were born so. To which there is no further reply. *Cadit Quaestio.* It is natural to suppose further that the circumcised angels who were born so is an exaggeration of this very defence of the uncircumcised Just. They were as the angels in Heaven. But this opened up the further challenge, 'Quomodo circumcisi sunt, qui non habebant membrum virile?' If any one doubts whether this question was actually raised, let him turn to the Ethiopic *Book of the Secrets of Heaven and Earth*[1] where he will find the necessary detail as to the virility of the angels with Scripture proof and dimensional observation.

It is necessary to go into this in some detail, because the doctrine of the necessity of circumcision, which is emphasized so strongly in Jubilees, is of necessity a Jewish doctrine. And if an early Gnostic writer like Theodotus maintains that the angels were baptized, he is converting Judaic arguments to anti-Judaic uses.

If it had not been for this curious preservation of the fragment of Theodotus by Clement of Alexandria, we should have said without hesitation that the verses about the angels in the Ode before us were definitely Jewish, and, in that case, we should have established Harnack's position that we are not dealing with a genuine Christian product. That fragment of Theodotus (the importance of which Dr. Bernard did not sufficiently realize) calls for a stay of judgement on the points at issue.

The investigation, so far as it has gone, will at least serve to remind us of the importance of the right understanding of the primitive anti-Judaic polemic, especially on its fundamental points, Circumcision, the Sabbath, and the Sanctuary. The question of Circumcision was raised in Judaism long before Christianity appeared. It was one of the features of the Hellenistic movement before the rise of Pharisaism, when the Jews took such pains to get rid of the sign, and to assimilate themselves to Greek manners. It is, therefore, extremely likely that part of the Christian polemic against Circumcision, say the objection on the score of the uncircumcised patriarchs, is prae-Christian; and we need to keep this possibility in mind when discussing what is said on the subject by early

[1] *Patr. Or.*, vol. i, p. 12. The writer quotes from *Jubilees*, as an authority for the circumcision of the angels.

Digitized by Google

Christian writers or early Christian books of Testimony. The person who is not familiar with anti-Judaic propaganda may be reminded that anti-Circumcision is not only in the New Testament, but that it pervades the first deposit of the literature. We do not, indeed, find it argued in the way Theodotus suggests. Justin Martyr is content to say that Enoch and the rest of the Patriarchal Company had the *spiritual* circumcision like ourselves. He does not say that they were baptized; he seems to avoid the inference, for he says that it is we, who had been sinners, who receive the covenant of circumcision *through baptism.* The contrast should be noted as well as the concordance.

In the earliest known forms of the *Testimony Book* anti-circumcision is one of the prominent articles. In verse 3 we have something like an imitation in Theophilus, *ad Autolycum*, iii. 15:

τὰ γὰρ μεταγενέστερα οὐ δύναται ποιεῖν τὰ αὐτῶν προγενέστερα,

a reference which may help us to restore the lost Greek.

For the Baptismal parallels, we may take:

Baptism as grace (verse 6). Basil (*P. G.* col. 373):

χάριν λέγειν τὸ βάπτισμα ἔθος.

For baptism as seal; and as mark of ownership. Greg. Naz. (*P. G.* 36, 361–4):

σφραγὶς δέ, ὡς συντήρησις, καὶ τῆς δεσποτείας τοῦ Κυρίου σημεῖον.

For baptism as dew: Ephrem, *Hymn V in Epiph.*, verse 15:

ܡܢ ܛܠܟ ܪܣܣ ܡܟܝܟܘܬܝ

(from thy dew besprinkle my lowliness), &c.

We need not suppose that 'dew' acquires a merely baptismal connotation in the Syrian service books. Here are a few stray references from a volume of Jacobite prayers and sequences.

'Thy dew (ܛܠܟ) of grace and mercy
Bedew (ܪܣܣ) upon the faces of thy worshippers.'

This reference is important on account of the parallelism with the eleventh Ode v. 14 ('my face received the dew'), as well as with this fourth Ode:

and it is certainly not baptismal.

Digitized by Google

Again:

'Let thy dew (ܛܠܠܟ, O Lord the Saviour, descend to Sheol, and bedew (ܢܪܣܣ) upon the bones of the faithful departed.'

Here, again, there is no question of baptism, for the faithful dead are assumed to have been baptised. Apparently the ultimate origin of the expression as applied to the dead rests on Isa. xxvi. 19:

ἡ γὰρ δρόσος ἡ παρὰ σοῦ ἴαμα αὐτοῖς ἐστιν.

Note above the repetition of the idea: 'let thy dew bedew'. Here is another sentence to be used as a preface to the 35th Ode:

'Bedew, (ܪܣܣ) O Lord, the dew (ܛܠܐ) of thy grace upon the thirsty minds of our souls, that are dried up by sin.'

v. 9. The thought in verse 9 that God does not need us, but that we need God, is a common religious expression in Greek and early Christian literature. It occurs, for instance, in the *Apology of Aristides*, c. 1: 'There is no deficiency in Him, and He stands in need of nought, but everything stands in need of Him.'

In the fourth book of *Irenaeus against Heresies* the doctrine becomes a text upon which Irenaeus dilates for many pages, often in language suggesting the use of the Odes, and like the Odes, explaining that God gives us *His fellowship*, though He does not need us, nor our love, nor our gifts, nor our sacrifices. For example:

'Non quasi indigens Deus luminis, plasmavit Adam.'—Ed. Massuet, p. 243.

'In quantum enim Deus nullius indiget, in tantum homo indiget Dei communione.'—p. 244.

'et communionem habere cum Deo: ipse quidem nullius indigens; eis vero qui indigent eius, suam praebens communionem.'—p. 244.

'Ipse quidem nullius horum est indigens.'—p. 244.

'Nihil tamen indigente Deo ab homine.'—p. 247.

'Haec autem gloriosum quidem faciebant hominem, id quod deerat ei adimplentia, id est amicitiam Dei; Deo autem praestabant nihil; nec enim indigebat Deus dilectione hominis.'—p. 247.

'Non indigens Deus servitute eorum . . . . . . non indiget Deus oblatione eorum.'

Digitized by Google

'Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti.'—p. 249.

'Offerrimus autem ei, non quasi indigenti, sed gratias agentes: . . . . Deus non indiget eorum qui a nobis sunt, sic nos indigemus offerre aliquid Deo.'—p. 251.

The same formula recurs in Bardaisan:

'Everything that exists is in need of the Lord of all.'—*Patr. Syr.* ii. 548.

And in Ephrem (perhaps in criticism of Bardaisan), we find the statement:

'The Sons of Heresy strove to interpret (*or* proclaim) concerning Him, that He is in no need whatever.'—ed. Rom. ii. 522.

The formula turns up again in the (late) Hebrew *Testament of Naphtali*:

'It is not that He hath need of any creature, but that all the creatures in the world have need of Him.'—*Test. XII. Patr.*, ed. Charles, p. 237. 6.

v. 10. The reference in verse 10 to 'milk and honey' may be taken allegorically of the experience of souls who reach the spiritual Land of Promise, or symbolically by the sacramental use of milk and honey in the reception of newly-baptized persons, or in the Eucharist of certain non-Catholic bodies. There are certainly traces of a milk-and-honey sacrament in the early Church. For example, in the Epistle of Barnabas, we have a question raised as to the meaning of the milk and honey in the Old Testament. And after some preliminary allegorising to show that the believers in Jesus are themselves the good land, he asks 'Why milk and honey?' And the answer is that 'the young child is first quickened with honey and then with milk.'[1]

Probably this refers in the first instance to a folklore custom in connexion with newly-born children, but it seems to have very early developed into a Christian sacrament for new converts, who had been born again into the Kingdom of God.

[1] Besides Barnabas, we may refer to Tertullian, *De Corona*, c. 3 ('inde suscepti lactis et mellis concordiam praegustamus'), *adv. Marc.* i. 14. Clem. Alex. *Paed.* i. 6 (p. 128) and *Coptic Canons*, ii. 46.

Digitized by Google

The baptismal liturgy of the Ethiopic Church will furnish a good illustration of the reception of the neophyte with milk and honey:

> 'Discedentibus lac et mel datur et manu capiti imposita hac benedictione dimittuntur; ite in pace, filii baptismi.'[1]

It is not, however, by any means clear that the 'milk and honey' passages in the Odes will bear this interpretation. Ephrem attacks certain heretics (probably his favourite sport, the followers of Marcion and Bardaisan), who practice an actual Eucharist in milk and honey.

> 'Instead of bread, (figure of) the show-bread, they offer the sacrifice of honey and milk, but although these are pure, they had no right to disturb by these (the order of the Church). For honey was not sufficient for a sacrifice, nor milk for aspersion and libation.'—Ephrem., *R. E.* ii. 543.

ODE V

1 I will give thanks unto thee, O Lord;
Because I love thee:

2 O Most High, do not thou forsake me,
For thou art my hope.

3 Freely I have received thy grace; Cf. Matt. x. 8.
I shall live[2] thereby. *or*, May I live.

4 My persecutors will come but let them not see me. Cf. Jer. xx. 11.

5 Let a cloud of darkness fall on their eyes, Cf. Ps. lix. 13 and lxix. 23.
And let an air of thick gloom darken them.

6 And let them have no light to see,
That they may take hold upon me.

7 Let their counsel become thick darkness: Cf. Ps. vii. 16, 17.
And what they have cunningly devised, let it return upon their own heads.

[1] See Trumpff, *Taufliturgie der Aeth. Kirche* in *Abhandl. der I. Klasse der K. Akad. d. Wiss.* (1878, München), Bd. XIV, Abth. iii, S. 153.

[2] *Or*, may I live.

Digitized by Google

Cf. Ps. xxi. 12. 8 For they have devised a counsel,
And it has come to nought.

Cf. Copt. (Powerful as they were, they were overcome).

9 They have prepared themselves maliciously,
And were found to be ineffective.

10 For my hope is upon the Lord;
And I will not fear:

Cf. Ps. xxvii. 1. 11 And because the Lord is my salvation,
I will not fear.

12 And He is as a garland on my head,
And I shall not be moved;

Cf. Ps. xxx. 7. 13 Even if everything should be shaken,
I stand firm:

14 And if (all) things visible should perish,
I shall not die;

15 Because the Lord is with me,
And I am with Him.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. In comparing the Coptic and Syriac texts of this Ode, we are struck at once by the Coptic opening; the natural translation of the Coptic verb is 'manifestabo tibi'; and we should at first sight conclude that this is a misunderstanding of the Syriac text by the substitution of ܡܘܕܥܢܐ for ܡܘܕܝܢܐ; i. e. 'I will make known' for 'I will give thanks'. It should, however, be noted that if the Coptic is a translation from the Greek, it is certain that we have here the rendering of the Greek ἐξομολογήσομαι exactly as in Gen xxix. 35 and elsewhere. There is, therefore, no difference between the Coptic and the Syriac.

Digitized by Google

v. 5. In the Syriac known to us, we cannot see a good meaning for the plural word ܟܘܡܬ̈ܐ which we have translated from the context by 'thick darkness'. This rendering is suggested by the root ܟܡܐ, when used of 'darkness' or 'tumour'. If it is not a word completely mutilated by copyists, it must be registered in any future Syriac dictionary. It seems to refer to a kind of mirage, hallucination, or to a defect in perception, which notion is generally expressed in Syriac with a plural noun, cf. ܡܢܬܢܣܝܬܐ, ܣܡܝܘܬ̈ܐ, ܪ̈ܘܙܐ. One might also suggest a substitute ܠܐܒܕܐ 'to perdition, to nothing', which would answer to the Coptic 'inefficax', but it is rather a violent change. If one is allowed to substitute a word, ܟܡܝܪ̈ܐ, which is used in verse 5, would be the best.

In verse 8 the Coptic has the equivalent of

'nec factum est illis',

which is suspiciously like good Syriac.

Expository Notes.

The interest of this Ode lies in the fact that at this point we begin to strike the coincidences with the *Pistis Sophia*. The latter part of the Ode from the twelfth verse was similar in its language to the first Ode of the collection, and led to a misunderstanding on the part of the Gnostic Commentator, who mistook one Ode for the other, and so, providentially, preserved for us in his comments the missing first Ode in the collection. Whether this fifth Ode is Christian or not did not appear decisively at the first reading. It contains a somewhat Jewish section in verses 4–9, with prayer for the discomfiture of one's enemies. If there is a definite Christian feature, it is, perhaps, the garland upon the singer's head, which occurs in several Odes, sometimes in a definitely Christian context. The close of the Ode is a noble expression of trust in the Lord, amidst adverse circumstances, which one instinctively compares with the close of the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. We do not doubt, therefore, that it is a Christian composition.

The writer is dependent upon the Davidic Psalter, either directly or through the medium of a book of extracts. The prayers for the confusion of one's enemies are taken ultimately from Psalm lxviii. (lxix.) 22, &c., from which Psalm loans are made in Romans xi. 9, 10 (the anti-Judaic section of the Epistle, chiefly made up out of *Testimonia*). In verse 10 the model is in Psalm xxvii. 1: 'The Lord is my light and my salvation,

Digitized by Google

whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid?'

The Syriac is a little nearer to the Hebrew ('my *salvation*'); the Coptic and the Greek, ('thou art my *Saviour*').

In verse 2 the Coptic has 'O Lord' for the Syriac, 'O Most High'; The Gnostic Targum has in a neighbouring clause, 'O light (i. e. God) of the height'; it has been suggested that this is a reflexion from the Syriac 'Most High'; it is not clear, however, that the clauses are parallel.

In verse 4 the relation between the Sahidic and Syriac texts is again obscure: the Sahidic has 'fall' for the Syriac 'come', and the Gnostic Targum appears to know both readings: for it has 'Let them *fall* ...... let them *come* and not see me'. But the Syriac also has 'fall' in verse 5 for the Coptic 'cover'. It is not safe, under such confusions in the text to draw any conclusions as to the relations between the Gnostic Targum and the Text.

ODE VI

1 As (the hand) moves over the harp, and the strings speak;

2 So speaks in my members the Spirit of the Lord,
And I speak by His love.

3 For He destroys what is foreign,
And everything is of the Lord.

4 For thus He was from the beginning,
And (shall be) to the end.

5 That nothing should be His adversary,
And nothing should stand up against Him.

1 Cor. ii 12. 6 The Lord has multiplied His knowledge;
And was zealous that those things should be known which by His grace have been given to us.

7 And the praise of His name He gave us:[1]
Our spirits praise His holy Spirit.

[1] *Lit.* And His praise He gave us for His name.

Digitized by Google

8 For there went forth a stream, Cf. *Sap. Sol.* vii. 25.
And became a river great and broad: Cf. Ezek. xlvii.
It swept away everything, and broke up and carried away the Temple.

9 And the restraints (made) by men were not able to restrain it,
Nor the arts of those whose (business it is to) restrain water.

10 For it spread over the face of the whole earth, Cf. Hab. ii. 14.
And it filled everything.

11 All the thirsty upon earth were given to drink (of it):
And thirst was done away and quenched:

12 For from the Most High the draught was given.

13 Blessed then are the ministers of that draught,
Who have been entrusted with that water of His:[1]

14 They have assuaged the dry lips,
And the will that had fainted they have raised up:

15 And souls that were near departing
They have held back from death:

16 And limbs that had fallen Cf. Isa. xxxv. 3; Heb. xii. 12.
They have straightened and set up:

17 They gave strength to their coming
And light to their eyes.

18 For everyone knew them in the Lord, Cf. Isa. lxi. 9; John iv. 14.
And they lived by the water an eternal life.

Hallelujah.

[1] *Or*, its water.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 1. ܐܝܕܐ 'hand' is not found in the manuscript, where a small erasure has caused a word to disappear, leaving only the final *alaph*. This *alaph* seems to have a certain stroke joining it with the preceding letter; in this case the word could not have been ܐܝܕܐ but perhaps ܪܘܚܐ 'spirit' (so Barnes), or another short vocable; cf. the following:

ܕܗܐ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܩܢܝܐ ܐܝܬܝ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܕܟܬܘܒܐ
ܐܘܟܝܬ ܟܢܪܐ ܡܕܡ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܙܡܪ ܒܝ

Bar Penkāyé, p. 147; MS. in John Rylands Library.

'Behold I am like a pen in the hand of the writer: that is to say, a harp, and the Holy Spirit sings in me.'

We have a possible reminiscence of the Odes in this sentence of John of Phenek.

v. 3. In view of the rules dealing with the attributive adjective Schulthess has suggested a *dālath* to be added to ܢܘܟܪܝ of the MS. In poetry, one meets occasionally with a word before which this *dālath* has been omitted. This same *dālath* is eliminated frequently after ܡܕܡ as in

ܡܕܡ ܢܘܟܪܝ ܓܕܫܟ (Bar Penkāyé, p. 70.)

'Something strange happened to thee.'

In the next line, Gressmann's reading ܕܡܪܝܕܐ 'recalcitrant' instead of ܕܡܪܝܐ ܗܘ 'of the Lord', and Grimme's suggestion of ܡܪܝܪܐ 'bitter', are not necessary.

v. 6. Grimme's emendation of ܐܬܡܟܟܝ for ܐܬܡܟܟ of the MS. is grammatically erroneous. The addition of a *yōdh* to the third pers. fem. plur. also frequently used by copyists is not warranted by the Syriac Grammar (cf. Ode vii. 20).

v. 8. The translation which would make ܟܠ ܡܕܡ the object of the three verbs ܓܪܦ, ܘܬܒܪ, ܘܐܝܬܝ, and which would take the *lāmadh* of ܠܗܝܟܠܐ as dative as if 'it swept everything, broke up (everything) and brought (everything) to the temple' is the less probable, because (1) it would have been more natural in Syriac to put ܟܠ ܡܕܡ at the end of the verbs, (2) the verb would be logically in the wrong place; what would 'break up everything to the temple' mean in Syriac? That the verb ܐܝܬܝ is used in the Odes with the sense of '(waters) carried' is evident

Digitized by Google

from Ode xxxix. 1. The Coptic text is perplexed over this verb, and omits the translation; and, wrongly taking the *lāmadh* as a sign of dative and reading ܐܠܐ for ܐܠܗܐ, exhibits: 'Attraxit eos omnes (?) et conversa est super templum.' Bacon, quoting Torrey, suggests for the last words an Aramaic original which would have been misunderstood by the translators; the theory is that the original was a Biblical Aramaic, ולא איתי להכלא 'and there was nobody to impede'. The negative לא would have disappeared by loss or by neglect, and the translators would have taken the איתי as a verb 'to carry', whereas it simply meant 'there was nobody to restrain'. This makes an excellent introduction to the following verses about the *restrainers*.

v. 18. This is the only meaning the Syriac sentence can have. In adding a ܕ before ܚܝܐ we obtain the sense of the Coptic 'the water of the eternal life'.

Expository Notes.

This is the second of the 'Temple' Odes, if we do not get rid of the reference to the Temple in the text: by means of the ingenious suggestion made by Professor Torrey that the words 'and it carried away the Temple' might be a perversion of an original Aramaic expression 'and there was none to restrain'. We do not propose, however, to alter the text at this point; it is intelligible as it stands.

The Ode appears, at first sight, to exhibit a change of subject at the eighth verse, where the stream of living water is introduced. The discontinuity disappears on a closer study of the preceding verses, in which the writer shows, by way of preface, that it is impossible to resist God, and that the diffusion of His knowledge is certain, in fact, it is already accomplished. He has in mind Habakkuk ii. 14, 'the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God as the waters cover the sea'; and Psalm lxxii. 19, 'Blessed be his glorious name for ever, and let the whole earth be filled with his glory'.[1] The first of these passages is the key to verse 6, 'The Lord has multiplied his knowledge', and to verse 10, 'It spread over the face of the whole earth and it filled everything'. The tenth verse is anticipated in the sixth.

The passage in the Psalm is the reason for the reference to the praise

[1] Perhaps also we should refer to *Sap. Sol.* i. 7: 'The Spirit of the Lord has filled the earth.'

Digitized by Google

of His glorious name in verse 6. We can see the mind of the writer at work. He then proceeds to describe the flowing out of the waters and their destination. The Greek term employed in the Coptic Ode (out of which the writer of *Pistis Sophia* makes such extraordinary Gnostic developments) describes the flood as *ἀπόρροια*. This takes us to the language of the Wisdom of Solomon, vii. 25, where wisdom is described as 'an effluence of the glory of the Creator'. Here again we have the idea of the diffusion of the knowledge of the glory of God.

Further, the restrainers who build dykes to stop the flow of the stream are anticipated in verse 5 ('Nothing shall stand up against Him').

In this Psalm we are again fortunate in having a large part of the Coptic text preserved to us; and as is common in Coptic texts, Greek words are exhibited in it. It was the occurrence of the Greek word *ἀπόρροια*, and the use of it by the Gnostic writer *Pistis Sophia*, which led Ryle and James to suggest, with some hesitation, that the Odes are Gnostic, in which supposition they were followed for a time by Harnack (*Hist. of Dogma*, i. 207, note). Ryle and James were, however, careful to say that 'We cannot see that there is anything unmistakably Gnostic in the doctrine'; and Harnack has also, since the publication of the complete Odes, withdrawn the suggestion.

The comparison of the Syriac and Coptic texts in this Ode is very instructive. In verse 9 the Coptic has a text which involves a Syriac ܒ̈ܢܝܢܐ ('buildings') in place of ܡܟ̈ܠܝܢܐ ('restraints'). Clearly the latter is the right form, and corresponds to the presence of ܟܠܝܘܗܝ and ܡܟܠܝܢ.

In verse 14 the Coptic has *converterunt*, which suggests a Syriac text ܐܗܦܘ or ܐܣܚܘ instead of ܐܚܝܘ, which is clearly the right reading. In the latter half of the verse the translation of the Coptic text is in error and there are two letters missing in the text itself: 'accipiebant gaudium cordis qui soluti erant', should be corrected to 'propositum cordis', which would answer to the Syriac; and instead of *accipiebant* the addition of the letters ce[1] to the verb give us *elevabant* which answers to the Syriac ܐܪܝܡܘ.

More difficult is the variation in verse 17, where we have apparently *παρουσία* underlying the Syriac, and *παρρησία* underlying the Coptic. The parallelism between the second clauses of the 14th and 16th verses

[1] ⲁⲩϫⲓⲥⲉ for ⲁⲩϫⲓ.

Digitized by Google

should be noted (ܐܬܡܣܝ), and it is natural to infer that to the *paralysed* will we should affirm *paralysed* limbs. But this takes us, as suggested in the margin, into Isaiah xxxv (τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα), and makes it increasingly likely that for παρουσία we should read some word expressing 'paralysis'.

We cannot, however, regard the question of the reading as satisfactorily settled. There is something to be said for the Coptic παρρησία. It is a word which had almost an esoteric meaning in early Christian circles, and in the New Testament it describes the Christian attitude before the judges of earth and the Judge of Heaven. It may turn out to be the right word; in that case the Syriac is simply a misreading of an original or transliterated Greek from παρρησία to παρουσία. No other satisfactory suggestions have been made. Gressmann[1] suggests ἀρρωστία, which is a long way off either the Syriac or the Sahidic. It would make excellent sense, and a perfect parallel.

The last verse of the Ode is obscure. What does it mean that 'every one knew them in the Lord'? Is it any clearer if we translate 'They all recognized one another in the Lord'?

Perhaps the Odist is drawing upon Isaiah lxi. 9: 'all that see them shall acknowledge them', but then an additional clause is required. We may imagine a sentence

'Every one acknowledged them
(That they are the Israel of God)';

and the concluding half-verse might then be an imitation of

'Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation':

for 'to live an eternal life' is, in Syriac, a good translation for 'to be saved with an eternal salvation' (Isa. xlv. 17). We leave it as an unsolved problem.

This Ode is one of those that furnish the strongest ground for the belief in a Greek original. The ἀπόρροια of which the Ode speaks has been shown to be a characteristic term, of the Wisdom-Christology; and it has also been pointed out that the Odes are strongly marked in other places by the doctrine of the Divine Wisdom which the Christians identified with Jesus Christ.

As, however, there is a good deal of evidence in favour of the belief

[1] *Deutsche LZ.*, 1911, No. 46.

Digitized by Google

that the Odes were originally written in Aramaic and not in Greek, it becomes proper to inquire what re-statement or alternative interpretation ought in that case to be made of the Ode before us.

It will still be true that the flowing stream is the stream of the Divine Knowledge which covers the whole earth as the waters cover the sea, and which is identified by the sequence of the Ode with the Holy Spirit; but ought we any longer to lay stress on the term ἀπόρροια if that term only comes in by way of a translation? Is there any alternative origin for the river?

In this connexion we may observe that amongst the titles given to Christ in the *Testimony Books*, we not only find that Christ is identified with Sophia, but we find traces of the description of Him under the title of River.

Eusebius in his treatise against Marcellus enumerates a number of titles of Christ with appropriate proof-texts, nearly all of which are traditional *Testimonia*. Amongst them we find

> 'And he was called River by the one who said, The rushings of the river make glad the City of God: (Ps. xlvi. 4).'—Euseb. *c. Marcel.* i, p. 97.

So the suggestion arises whether this passage in the Psalm may be the theme of our Odist. The passage turns up again in the *Demonstratio Evangelica* of Eusebius, in sequence with the 25th chapter of Isaiah, and Eusebius, having quoted the Psalm, proceeds to say that 'this passage indicates the unremittent flow (ἐπιρροήν) *of the Divine Spirit*, which has its source from above and waters the City of God'. We notice how near Eusebius came to calling the river in the Psalm an ἀπόρροια. Augustine, too, in commenting upon the Psalm, asks the question:

'Qui sunt isti impetus fluminis?'

and replies,

'Inundatio illa *Spiritus sancti*, de quo Dominus dicebat,' &c.

Now let us see whether, on the hypothesis that the 46th Psalm has been used by the Odist, we can find any linguistic agreement between the Ode and the Psalm in Syriac or in the Aramaic of the Targum.

The verse which we have to discuss is translated in English, following the Hebrew, as follows:

> 'There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the City of God, the holy place of the Tabernacles of the Most High.'

Digitized by Google

The Syriac, however, and the Targum do not translate like this; they begin with 'Streams of rivers', and we notice that the word for 'stream' is precisely the word ܝܒܠܐ in the Ode. Here, then, we may, perhaps find the origin of the 'brook' or 'stream' that became a 'river'.

In the next place we notice that the river is to irrigate the City of God, and *in particular the sanctuary*. Here, then, we have the suggestion that the river which sweeps everything away and *brings to the Temple* (ܐܝܬܝ ܠܗܝܟܠܐ) does precisely what the Psalm says it ought to do: there is, perhaps, no need to alter the text at all, even by the insertion of an object. If, however, we like to make a free emendation, it would be possible to read ܚܕܝ ܠܗܝܟܠܐ 'it made glad the Temple'; but this is not quite fair to the existing text. Why should it not simply come to the Temple?

The Targum on the Psalm has a curious interpretation of the streams and the City; it says:

> 'The peoples are like *rivers* and their *fountains*: they *come* and make glad the City of God; and they pray *in the Holy House* of God, *in the tabernacle* of the Most High.'

This brings out again the connexion between the streams and the Temple: *they are streams of proselytes*, according to the Targum. There is, however, not much linguistic parallel between the Targum and the Ode. On the whole, it appears to be possible that the Odist has the 46th Psalm in mind, especially since we have reason to believe that the 'river' in that Psalm was an ancient Christian testimony.

A further alternative interpretation may be offered. The question arises whether this stream, which we have identified with the Knowledge of the Lord, which is to cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, is not immediately derived from the 24th chapter of Sirach, where Wisdom enunciates her own praises. In v. 30 she says '*I came out as a stream* from a river', and in v. 31 with a change in the metaphor,

> '*My stream became a river*, and my river became a sea!'

The parallel with the Ode is very close and suggestive. We may also compare v. 25

> [The Most High] maketh wisdom abundant as Phison and as Tigris,

with the language of the Ode,

> The Lord has multiplied the knowledge of himself.

Unfortunately the Syriac version of Sirach does not help us here.

Digitized by Google

ODE VII

1 As is the motion of anger over evil,
So is the motion of joy over the Beloved,
And brings in of its fruits without restraint.

2 My joy is the Lord, and my motion is towards Him:
This path of mine is excellent.

3 For I have a Helper, to the Lord.
He hath shown Himself to me without grudging in His simplicity;
Because His kindness has minished His greatness. (Euseb. *D. E.* vi. 9.)

4 He became like me that I might receive Him. (Cf. John i. 12.)
In similitude was He reckoned like me, that I might put Him on.

5 And I trembled not when I saw Him;
Because He was gracious to me.

6 Like my nature He became, that I might learn Him,
And like my form, that I might not turn back from Him.

7 The Father of Knowledge
Is the Word of Knowledge: (Cf. John i. 1.)

8 He who created Wisdom (Cf. Prov. viii. 22 (LXX).)
Is wiser than His works:

9 And He who created me when yet I was not
Knew[1] what I should do when I came into being:

[1] MS. 'knows'.

Digitized by Google

10 Wherefore He pitied me in His abundant grace
And granted me to ask from Him and to receive from His sacrifice;

11 For He it is that is incorrupt;
The perfection of the worlds and the Father of them. Cf. Isa. ix. 6 (Heb.).

12 He hath given Him to appear to them that are His; Cf. John i. 11.
That they may recognize Him that made them;
And that they might not suppose that they came of themselves. Cf. Ps. c. 3.

13 For it is to Knowledge He hath appointed His way; Cf. Prov. viii. 22.
He hath widened it and extended it and brought it to all perfection.

14 And He set over it the traces of His light;
And it proceeded therein even from the beginning to the end. Cf. Sap. Sol. viii. 1.

15 For by Him He was served,
And He was pleased with the Son; Cf. Mark i. 11, &c.

16 And because of His salvation He will take possession of everything; Cf. Matt. xi. 27.
And the Most High shall be known in His saints:

17 To announce to those that have songs of the coming of the Lord
That they may go forth to meet Him and may sing to Him, Cf. Matt. xxv. 6.
With joy and with the harp of many tones.

18 The Seers shall go before Him,
And they shall be seen before Him;

19 And they shall praise the Lord in His love;
Because He is near and seëth;

20 And hatred shall be taken from the earth;
And along with jealousy it shall be drowned:

21 For ignorance hath been destroyed;
Because the knowledge of the Lord hath arrived.

22 Let the Singers sing the grace of the Lord Most High;
And let them bring their songs;

23[a] And let their heart be like the day,
And like the excellent beauty of the Lord, their harmonies;

Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 7, 10. 23[b] And let there be nothing without life,
Nor without knowledge, nor dumb.

24 For (the Lord) hath given a mouth to His creation,
To open the voice of the mouth towards Him; and to praise Him;

25 Confess[1] ye His power;
And show forth His grace.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. We could take the verb ܡܥܠ in both meanings (*a*) 'He causes to enter, introduces' from ܥܠܠ; (*b*) 'He gives, yields fruits' (Ar. أغلّ) from ܥܠܠܬܐ. The second meaning is more appropriate.

v. 3. We have suggested in the text that this sentence might be regarded as an attempt to translate βοηθὸν γὰρ ἔχω τὸν Κύριον, but in taking the *lāmadh* of ܠܡܪܝܐ as meaning direction to, we should have the good literal meaning 'Because I have a helper to the Lord', as Labourt rightly suggests. In the preceding verse, there is a mention of the way of the

[1] *Perhaps* 'Manifest'.

Digitized by Google

Odist to his Lord; his way is easy and good, and he is joyful in walking in it towards God because he has the Christ as a companion and helper who, in his own words, 'showed Himself (or His soul) to me, 'without grudging in His simplicity'. That this is probably the meaning of the sentence is also attested by the fact that it is the Odist who is speaking here, and not the Lord Christ who showed Himself to him. The Father of the Lord comes in verses 12, 15, 16, where, especially in this last verse, He is called ܡܪܝܡܐ 'The Most High'. It is worth noticing that in Ode viii, verses 6, 8 where the word ܡܥܕܪܢܐ 'helper' occurs, there is also the same occurrence of both ܡܪܝܐ and ܡܪܝܡܐ; in Ode xxi. 2, this 'helper' who is the Lord is again assisting the Odist. In Ode xxv. 2, God is again the 'helper' of the Odist.

The expression ܕܠܐ ܚܣܡܐ equivalent to ἀφθόνως is frequently used in Syriac literature, e.g.

ܒܗܢܐ ܝܪܚܐ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܢܒܥܬ ܡܘܗܒܬܟ ܕܠܐ ܚܣܡ

'In this propitious month Thy bounty overflowed abundantly upon all.'—Ephr. ed. Lamy, II, 773.

Cf. also in the Roman edition II, 453; III, 72, 88 and in *Spic. Syr.*, p. ܗ. Cf. also

ܝܗܒܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܚܣܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܝܗܒ ܠܗܘܢ

Bar Penkāyé, p. 99 (MS. in John Rylands Library), ibid., p. 2.

'They give without grudging as it was given to them.'

The use of the expression does not necessarily imply translation.

In the next line, Connolly has argued that ܦܫܝܛܘܬܗ might be a translation of ἁπλότης, 'liberality' and 'simplicity'. If this surmise is considered as possible, it holds good in Syriac also, where the word has the more appropriate meaning of 'kindness', 'gentleness', 'meekness'; see *Vocabulaire chaldéen-arabe*, and *Dictionnaire de la langue chaldéenne*. One might also compare the sense of the word in Odes xxvii. 3; xlii. 2, in the sense of 'outstretching [of hands]', 'extension', and possibly 'crucifixion'

In the third line the opinion expressed by Labourt that instead of ܒܒܣܝܡܘܬܗ we might read ܒܒܣܝܡܘܬܐ is improbable without changing the verb ܐܬܕܒܪ as well.

v. 6. Frankenberg unnecessarily suggests that for the meaningless (!) ܕܐܠܒܫܘܗܝ we should read ܕܐܠܒܫܘܗܝ. The Syriac word is the aorist of the verb ܠܒܫ and is lexicographically and grammatically correct.

v. 7. In this verse, the word Knowledge is used as an equivalent of Truth and Wisdom, as appears from the next verse which is a reflection of the great Wisdom passage in Proverbs (viii. 22):

'The Lord created me (Wisdom) the beginning of His ways,'

to which verse the writer returns in verse 13:

'He hath appointed Knowledge as His way.'

That the writer has the Wisdom passages in his mind appears again from verse 14, where Knowledge is said to 'proceed from the beginning to the end', which appears to be *Sap. Sol.* viii. 1:

'She (Wisdom) extendeth from end unto end mightily.'

v. 10. Nestle has suggested that the original was the Greek οὐσία which the Syriac translator read θυσία. This is a possible but somewhat daring hypothesis. For a right understanding of the Syriac word which means also 'favour', 'gift', the following sentence of Ephrem may be quoted:

ܟܝܢܗ ܕܠܐ ܒܗܬ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܦ ܫܢܬܐ ܢܕܡܟ ܐܦ ܕܢܫܐܠ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ

'He [Christ] was not ashamed of sleeping and of soliciting benefactions.'
II, 514 (*R. E.*)

Connolly suggests that the word might have been ܪܒܘܬܗ 'His greatness', or ܕܡܘܬܗ 'His likeness'. With less probability Bruston substitutes ܕܒܥܝܬܗ, Grimme ܡܢ ܡܒܥܝܬܗ, and Brockelmann ܪܒܝܬܗ. Taking the word in the sense of 'gift', 'munificence', 'favour', which, as we have seen, it possesses in Syriac, the sentence would read 'And granted me to ask from Him and to receive from His largesse'.

v. 12. Wellhausen, followed by Kittel, considers ܠܗ as a reflexive pronoun and translates 'Er lässt sich schauen von den Seinen'. We consider this to be improbable in Syriac; further, in verse 10 of the Ode, and in many other verses, the verb ܝܗܒ is always used with the pronouns in the sense of 'to give to'.

v. 13. It is possible to translate as above 'For knowledge He hath

Digitized by Google

set as His way' (so also Connolly). The Syriac wording, however, would be somewhat weak. Ode xviii. 7, contains a similar phrase, and in view of the uncertainty of the real meaning of the sentence, we have left in the translation a rendering which is more in harmony with the ordinary course of a Syriac way of expression.

Frankenberg suggests the elimination of the fem. *Hé* from ܣܡܗ̇. This is good but not necessary. When emphasis is intended in a sentence the suffixes may be used redundantly.

v. 14. One could also translate ܘܗܠܟܬ݀ 'and I walked'. We have retained the reading of the MS. which, by exhibiting a dot over the *taw*, induces us to translate 'it proceeded', referring by it to 'way'. Gressmann proposes to read ܘܗܠܟܬܐ 'steps', and Frankenberg ܘܗܠܟܝ.

The expression 'the traces of the light' (ἴχνη τοῦ φωτός) is obscure; it occurs again in Ode xv. 6, and evidently has a special meaning: the ἴχνη are *footprints* which one follows: the context suggests walking.

v. 15. Instead of ܦܠܚ 'He was served' or 'wrought' of the MS., we have suggested the slight emendation of ܫܠܚ 'He was sent'.

We cannot say 'By it (knowledge) He was served', on account of the feminine suffix required in that case; so we render 'By Him' and refer back to verse 12.

In the last clause of the verse a similar difficulty arises: we have rendered it as 'the Father pleased in the Son' rather than 'Wisdom (the Mother)'.

It is possible that we have here an allusion to God's delight in Wisdom as his chief workman (Prov. viii. 30), the 'Son' having displaced the original Wisdom-idea. In that case we should have read ܡܕܝܢܗ̇ for ܡܕܝܢܗ (the mere addition of a single dot).

v. 17. Frankenberg's suggestion that we should eliminate the *dālath* of ܕܡܐܬܝܬܗ and consider the word as a direct complement to ܠܡܣܒܪܘ is not necessary, in spite of the plausible meaning which the sentence would have: *To announce the coming of the Lord to* . . .

Bruston proposes to read ܠܡ ܣܒܪܘ 'announce well'. This emendation is, however, improbable, inasmuch as an expletive particle is commonly placed after the verb; further, it is obviously erroneous to use here the particle ܠܡ in the sense of 'well'.

v. 18. The suggestion made by Gressmann and followed by Kittel

Digitized by Google

that ܚܬܬܐ can be taken as a past participle ܚܬܬܐ, is not very good as far as the Syriac is concerned. The paronomasia in the text should be noted.

v. 19. Gressmann unnecessarily proposes ܘܚܙܐ 'and He is seen' for ܘܚܙܐ 'and He sees' of the MS.

v. 20. Cod H has ܬܬܐܒܕܝ. A *yodh* is frequently added by the copyist at the end of the 3rd pers. fem. sing. of the aorist. Its insertion is more frequent in modern than in ancient manuscripts, and in the case of the two MSS. of the Odes, it is much less used by B than by H. Grammatically this *yodh* is erroneous. See Mingana, *Syr. Gram.*, No. 204.

v. 23. Gressmann proposes unnecessarily ܢܫܡܬܗܘܢ 'their breath' for ܢܩܫܬܗܘܢ 'their harmonies'. Grimme, favoured by Kittel, considers ܕܢܩܫܐ to be a mistake for ܕܢܩܫܐ 'etwas Widerstrebendes'. This emendation does not seem, however, to be in harmony with the verse. Probably a ܕܠܐ which appears twice in the following member of the verse, has by inadvertence been omitted by the scribe. The meaning it gives is obvious and appropriate. Connolly's suggestion ܕܦܠܓ becomes unnecessary.

v. 24. Gressmann unnecessarily proposes ܩܠܐ ܘܦܘܡܐ 'voice and mouth' instead of ܩܠܐ ܕܦܘܡܐ 'the voice of the mouth' of the MS.

v. 25. In the text we have printed ܫܒܚܬܐ and added the following note, 'Perhaps ܫܒܚܬܗ'. As it happens, this is actually the reading of the MS. !

Expository Notes.

There are a number of obscurities in this Ode, both in the text and in the translation. We have not succeeded in resolving them all. It is clear that the Odist is occupied in the first instance with the Incarnation, considered as a diminution of Deity for the sake of the human race, who are thus made capable of an elevation that should correspond with the Divine descent. Salvation consists in the right understanding of this mystery; it is a case of Salvation by Knowledge, so that on the surface it might seem as if the Hymn were Gnostic: but not all that affects Gnosis is Gnostic.

The word which we have translated 'impulse' in verse 1 is literally 'running'. The suggestion arises as to whether the language may not be based upon Cant. i. 3, 'Draw me, *we will run* after thee', where the person addressed is the Beloved. Thus the identification of the Beloved leads to the identification of Canticles as the source of the 'running'. It is a 'chase of joy', because the text in Canticles goes on with 'we will

Digitized by Google

rejoice and exult in thee'. The 'helper' in v. 3 of the Ode may, perhaps, be involved in '*draw* me, we will run'.

If the foregoing identification of the sources of the Odist is correct, we need have no doubt that the title *Odes of Solomon* is primitive, and that the Odes have been attached to the group of Salomonic writings.

Dr. Abbott has made a similar suggestion of dependence upon Canticles (see 139 ff.).

We had the advantage for the interpretation of this Ode in the discovery of quotations made from it by certain early Fathers. The most important was a passage in Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica* (vi. 9, p. 267), to which we have drawn attention in a previous chapter. We showed that Eusebius, commenting on the 144th Psalm, explains that the Word of God, out of His kindness to men and His knowledge of them, minished Himself of His proper greatness, in order to make the human race worthy of His own knowledge. The coincidence in the language and in the thought with the expressions and ideas of the Ode enabled us to say that Eusebius had the Ode in his mind and was using it. We were able to show that the Ode had also been used in Syriac by the *Acts of Thomas*, (ed. Wright, p. ܪܥܘ), a reference which was valuable, in view of the known antiquity of these Acts and their Gnostic character.

The argument of the Odist that the Word became like us in order that we might become like him, may be illustrated from Ephrem's *Carmina Nisibena* (No. 3, p. 79):

> 'He Himself in His *goodness put on the human form*, that He might gather us together and make us *like to Himself*. . . . . . These things were done to our advantage, because that nature (*lit.* substance) became like to us, in order that we *might become like to it*.'

It is quite possible that Ephrem is working from our Ode as a base.

The same thing is true of the fourth of the *Epiphany Hymns*, where the language is used of the putting on of Christ in the act of baptism, by those who have previously put off the old man symbolically by a change of raiment. Thus we are told:

> iv. 11. 'How did the great one, who in His love was minished (ܕܐܙܥܪ ܗܘܐ) become persecuted by those who denied Him, and was adored by the watching (angels)'!
>
> 12. 'Let us become like Him who made Himself less than all and who being thus minished made all men great.'

(See also Ephrem. *R. E.* iii. 55, 58, 132).

Digitized by Google

The Incarnation is regarded as the Incarnation of the pre-existent Logos, who is here spoken of under the term Wisdom, in harmony with the language of Prov. viii. 22 ('the Lord created me'). It is important to note that the verse of Proverbs is here used in the language of the LXX: Κύριος ἔκτισέ με· Elsewhere the Odist uses the same passage in the Hebrew form, 'the Lord possessed me'; see Ode xli. Thus, if the unity of the Odes be conceded, the author was acquainted with both forms of the text, which is more than can be said of the Christian teachers for the next two centuries, who systematically bombard the Jew with the text of the LXX.

As the Incarnation is the incarnation of the Divine Wisdom, it was natural that salvation should consist in the knowledge of the Lord, and that we should have an article in the creed on the Abolition of Ignorance corresponding to the conventional one on the Forgiveness of Sins. The writer says so positively, verse 13:

'To Knowledge He hath appointed His way:'[1]

(which is a variation on Prov. viii. 22, 'The Lord created me His way'); and verse 27:

'Ignorance hath been destroyed because the Knowledge of the Lord has arrived.'

We have shown in a previous chapter that traces of this formula are to be found in the letters of Ignatius:

ἠφανίζετο κακίας ἄγνοια· καθῃρεῖτο παλαιὰ βασιλεία.

the *new* Kingdom is inferred to be the Knowledge of the Lord. We see now that our position in regard to the ἀπόρροια (of Wisdom) in Ode vi, that it represents the Knowledge of the Lord which covers the earth, was a correct one.

Ignatius continues his reference to the abolition of ignorance with the words 'When God was manifested as man for the renewal of eternal life'; the abolition was the result of the incarnation, exactly as in the Odes. And we have shown in a previous chapter that Marcus the Gnostic also taught that the 'abolition of ignorance became the knowledge of Jesus'.

[1] Batiffol suggests a slight emendation:

'Il a dirigé ma voie vers la science.'

Digitized by Google

We can now see why the Odist says at the close of his song that 'there shall be nothing without life or without knowledge', for from his point of view eternal life consists in the knowledge of the Lord. We have something to the same effect in the Gospel of John (xvii. 3):

> 'This is life eternal, that they might know thee . . . . . . and Jesus Christ.'

There is nothing necessarily Gnostic about it in a heretical sense; but it might easily become a point of departure for Gnostic teaching.

The term ܠܐ ܡܕܥܬܐ should be the exact equivalent of ἄγνοια; but it is good Syriac and not merely a translation. Cf. Ephrem (ed. Mitchell, p. 173):

ܡܕܥܬܗ ܠܐ ܡܕܥܬܐ ܬܗܘܐ

Stölten has pointed out that Marcus the Gnostic, of whom Irenaeus has so much to say, has an expression very like that in the Odes. Amongst other silly sports, in some of which early orthodox people also joined, he amused himself with Gematria over the name of Christ and the name of Jesus. The knowledge of the Lord, according to Marcus, was the knowledge of His name, and the letters and numbers thereof. When the name of Jesus with its six sacred letters was disclosed, then 'those who knew him ceased from ignorance, and mounted from death to life; the Name itself became to them the Way to the Father of Truth. For the Father of the universe willed the abolition of ignorance and the destruction of death. *But the abolition of ignorance became the knowledge of Him*'. (Iren. ed. Mass. 76.)

This is very close to the language of the Ode. It is capable of an orthodox interpretation, and it is possible that Marcus was only stupid and not exactly heretical at this point. He was proving an orthodox truth in a foolish manner: the truth itself was in the Ode. We may, perhaps, take this as an instance of the ill-luck that the Odes had in falling into the hands of the Valentinian Gnostics, of whom Marcus appears to have been one. We cannot with Stölten call it a case of Gnostic parallel. It is a quotation, a Biblical text.

The expression about the singers and seers who are to come before Him and to appear before Him, is obscure as to the seers: but the sentence itself imitates, in a Targumist manner, the language of Psalm xlii. 2:

> 'When shall I come and appear before God?'

Digitized by Google

The Peshitta says, 'When shall I come to see thy face?' The Targum has a circumlocution, and talks of 'seeing the Majesty': evidently the Syriac Psalter came too near to saying that God could be seen, and various ways were found of avoiding such an expression. The repetition of 'before Him' and the introduction of the passive 'shall be seen' instead of 'see' is in the manner of the Targums. In order to understand the situation more clearly we need to recall to our minds the offensiveness to the monotheistic thinker of such expressions as imply an actual vision of God. For instance, Philo has to explain away the passage in Exodus (xxiv. 10) where the elders of Israel

'Ate and drank and saw God also.'

His solution is:

'They saw the place of God.'—*De Somniis*, i. 11.

A severer theology would even have taken exception to such an expression as the 'place of God'.

Another instance, which shows how carefully the thought of an actual vision of God was avoided, will be found in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, where it is a capital charge against the prophet that he said he had seen the Lord. We remember how this is softened in the Fourth Gospel, after the manner of the Targumist, by saying that 'Isaiah said these things when he saw His glory'. Here the 'Glory' is one of the Divine Attributes substituted for God.

This then is the religious atmosphere in which the Odist finds himself. His answer to the question of the Syriac Psalter,

'When shall I come and see God?'

is that the seers will, indeed, come, they will come *before God* (as the Targumist speech constantly puts it), and they will not see God, but they will *be seen before Him*. The Authorized Version has drifted into something of the same circumlocutory speech.

In tracing the Biblical affinities of this Ode, special attention should be paid to the passage (v. 12) that is in dependence upon the 100th Psalm:

'He hath given Him (*or* Himself) to be seen of them that are His:
In order that they might recognize Him that made them,
And that they might not suppose that they came of themselves.'

Digitized by Google

It was evident at a glance that the passage was under the influence of the 100th Psalm:

'It is He that made us,
Not we ourselves.'

The late Professor Menzies remarked acutely on this identification, that the influence of the Psalm went further: for the Revisers of the Old Testament have altered the conventional 'not we ourselves' to 'and we are His'. And this emended reading is reflected in the Ode in the form

'to be seen of *them that are His.*'

At the same time, it is clear that the displaced reading is also in the Ode, in the words,

'that they might not suppose *that they came* (*or* were) *of themselves.*'

What then is the origin of this new rendering which turns up so unexpectedly? It is in the Hebrew Bible itself, which advises us to read for

ולא אנחנו ('and not we')
ולו אנחנו ('and to Him are we').

The Ḳeri, as it is called, which the reader is advised to substitute for the written text, is also found in the Targum, or popular exposition of the text. The Targum says very clearly:

עבד יתנא ודיליה אנחנא
'He made us, *and His we are.*'

The Peshiṭta text takes the other reading.

From the fact that the Odist knows and uses both readings, we are again confirmed in our opinion of his close and careful scholarship. Remembering, too, his habit of picking up the sequence of his thoughts from the text on which he is working, we see that we must go back to the words

'*Know* that the Lord, He is God,'

for the motive of the Odist's remark about

'*Recognizing Him that* made them,'

and the consequent statement that

'It is to *knowledge* that He hath appointed His way.'

Digitized by Google

The continuity of the Ode is not on the surface, but it is not so far underground that it cannot be traced. The Odist often turns back to strike over again the note of a previous verse: thus in the passage which we have been discussing,

> 'He hath given Him to be seen of them that are His,'

he has turned back to the previous verse, 'I trembled not when I saw Him', *sc.* the Christ who has assumed human nature.

We have not yet exhausted the influence of the 100th Psalm; for the Odist has worked in the opening sentence of the Psalm:

> 'Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands:
> Serve the Lord with gladness,
> Come before His presence with singing.'

Here we have the clue to the introduction of

> 'Those that have songs of the coming of the Lord;
> That they may go forth to meet Him and may sing to Him with joy,'

and to the reference to the question, which we have already discussed, in the 42nd Psalm,

> 'When shall I come and appear before God?'

The transition from the Knowledge of God to the Song of God, which at first sight is discontinuous, finds its explanation in the closer study of the 100th Psalm. We shall probably be justified in maintaining that the Odist, whom we know to have been acquainted with the Targum, has taken from thence the reading, which was suggested above by the Ḳeri of the Hebrew text.

Professor Menzies, to whom we have referred, thought that the use of the 100th Psalm with its obvious Gentile leanings was an indication that the Odes were what he calls 'Psalms of the Proselytes', viz. of proselytes to Judaism in the first century. We have referred to this theory in our Introduction.

In this Ode and in Ode x there is an expression that occurs twice over, which we have translated by

> 'The traces of the Light'.

The expression is a curious one, and by its recurrence suggests that it has been introduced into the Odes *ab extra.* But where shall we find any

Digitized by Google

such expression? Is it Biblical or Mystical or Gnostic? In Ode vii we are told that 'to Knowledge He has appointed His way . . . and set over it the *traces of His light*, and *I walked* (*or* it proceeded) therein from the beginning to the end'. The language suggests that 'traces' are really 'footprints'. In Ode x, the Odist says of the redeemed Gentiles that 'they confessed me in high places; and *the traces of the light* were *set upon their hearts; and they walked* in my life', where again there is a connexion between the 'footprints' and the 'walk'.

The nearest Biblical passage that shows any parallelism with the expression in the Odes is Sirach l. 29:

> μακάριος ὃς ἐν τούτοις ἀναστραφήσεται,
> καὶ θεὶς αὐτὰ ἐπὶ καρδίαν αὐτοῦ σοφισθήσεται·
> ἐὰν γὰρ αὐτὰ ποιήσῃ, πρὸς πάντα ἰσχύσει,
> ὅτι φῶς Κυρίου τὸ ἴχνος αὐτοῦ.

This is not very easy to translate; the English revisers present us with

> Blessed is he that shall be exercised in these things;
> And he that layeth them up in his heart shall become wise;
> For if he do them, he shall be strong for all things,
> For the light of the Lord is his guide:
> (marg. footstep.)

The connexion in Sirach between the underlined words and the language of the Odes should be noted. Further illumination seems necessary.

ODE VIII

1 Open ye, open ye your hearts to the exultation of the Lord:
And let your love abound from the heart, and even to the lips: Cf. Hos. xiv. 2, Heb. xiii. 15.
2 To bring forth fruits to the Lord, a holy life,
And to talk watchfully in His light.
3 Rise up and stand erect,
Ye who were sometimes brought low;
4 Ye who were in silence, speak out,
(Now) that your mouth hath been opened.

Digitized by Google

5 Ye who were despised, be lifted up;
Now that your righteousness has been lifted up;

6 For the right hand of the Lord is with you;
And He will be your helper.

7 And peace hath been prepared for you,
Before ever your war happened.

(Christ speaks.)

8 Hear the word of truth,
And receive the knowledge of the Most High

9 Your flesh does not know what I am saying to you;
Nor your raiment[1] what I am showing to you;

Cf. Clem. Hom. xix. 20.

10 Keep my secret, ye who are kept by it;

11 Keep my faith, ye who are kept by it.

12 And understand my knowledge,
Ye who know me in truth:

13 Love me with affection,
Ye who love:

14 For I do not turn away my face from them that are mine;
For I know them.

15 Before they came into being,
I took knowledge of them,
And on their faces I set my seal.

16 I fashioned their members;
My own breasts I prepared for them;
That they might drink my holy milk and live thereby.

[1] So MS.

Digitized by Google

17 I took pleasure in them,
And I am not ashamed of them.

18 For my workmanship are they,
And the strength of my thoughts:

19 Who then shall stand up against my handywork?
Or who is there that is not subject to them?

20 I willed, and fashioned mind and heart;
And they are mine. Cf. Ode xlii. *fin.*
And by my own right hand I set my elect ones.

21 And my righteousness goeth before them; Cf. Isa. lviii. 8.
And they shall not be detached from my name:
For it is with them.

(The Odist.)

22 Pray and abide continually in the love of the Lord;
Ye beloved ones, in the Beloved;
And ye who are kept, in Him that lived (again);
And ye that are saved, in Him that was saved.

23 And ye shall be found incorrupt in all ages,
To the name of your Father.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. Gressmann suggests the possible ܘܢܣܚܐ 'let it gush forth' instead of ܘܢܣܓܐ 'let it be multiplied'. Cf. Odes xvi. 2, xxxvi. 7, xl. 2 (*bis*). Although ܣܓܐ is generally used transitively, it is sometimes also used intransitively.

v. 2. Schulthess has suggested a *dālath* before ܚܝ̈ܐ 'of the life'. This, however, is not probable; the 'holy life' is a permutative term (بدل)

Digitized by Google

to 'fruits'; and Barth's hypothesis that we must read ܚܝܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ 'the Living and the Holy' is inadmissible in Syriac. Flemming's reading ܒܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ 'savagery', 'rudeness', instead of 'with watchfulness', 'with diligence', 'with fervency', is not good. Likewise in the case of ܠܡܡܠܠܘ 'to speak' which Schulthess proposes to change into ܠܡܗܠܟܘ 'to walk'. In verses 1 and 4 mention is made of speech and not of walk. To change the text so as to give meaning of 'Pour apporter des fruits au Seigneur, vivants, saints, et pour remplir la stupidité de sa lumière' (Bruston) is impossible in Syriac.

v. 9. The MS. has ܠܡܫܚܘܦܝܟܘܢ 'your raiment'. We have suggested in the text ܠܠܒܘܬܟܘܢ 'your hearts'. This is possibly a daring suggestion in view of the mention of 'your body' in the preceding line, and of the emphasis laid on the 'coats of skin' in Ode xxv. 8.

v. 12. Influenced by verse 14, Gressmann proposes the possible emendation ܝܕܝܥܝܢ ܠܝ 'are known to me' to ܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܝ 'know me' of the MS.

v. 20. Barth's suggestion that for ܠܓܒܝܠܝ we should read ܠܓܒܠܝ is useless; both forms are equally used in Syriac. His hypothesis that we should, perhaps, read ܠܓܒܝܠܬܝ or ܠܓܒܝܠܘܬܝ (my fashioned ones) in accordance with the verb previously used, is unnecessary.

v. 21. Instead of ܢܬܦܘܣܝܘܢ it would be better Syriac to read ܢܬܦܘܚܝܘܢ without the slightest change to the meaning.

v. 22. In the text we have placed the erroneous note 'Cod. ܐܬܟܫܦܘ'. The MS. actually bears the reading of the printed text. We translate 'pray and abide continually' rather than 'pray continually and abide'. A parallel for the existence of the ܘ between ܐܬܟܫܦܘ and ܦܘܫܘ may be seen in Philoxenus, *Discourses*, i, p. 215:

ܘܐܡܪ ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܢܦܫܐ ܘܚܝܠܐ

and Aphrahat (vol. ii, p. 140):

ܐܬܟܫܦܘ ܘܗܘܘ ܠܟܘܢ.

Bruston believes that ܒܥܘ is to be regarded as a substantive, *quaestio:* (écartez l'investigation). This is quite improbable.

Expository Notes.

This is the first of the Odes that is clearly marked with a dual personality, the Odist becoming at a certain point in the song the Lord

Digitized by Google

Himself. A number of Odes show the same peculiarity, which is common in the canonical Psalter: cf. for example, the change in the second Psalm, where the Psalmist makes way for the Father in verse 8 and for the Son in verse 9. The difficulty will lie in the delimitation of the speakers. In the present Ode the change occurs at the eighth verse; it has been prepared for by an oracular appeal to 'hear the Word of Truth'. Perhaps the poet re-appears in verse 22: all the intervening verses are *ex ore Christi*.

This is the Ode in which Dr. Bernard suspected allusion to the *disciplina arcani*, in the words, 'Keep my secret, ye who are kept by it'; and we have shown that there is a striking parallel in the baptismal lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem. But here again we have the difficulty to meet that the formula is an ancient one, and is probably taken from a saying of Jesus in an uncanonical Gospel, and goes back ultimately to the prophet Isaiah (see Isa. xxiv. 16 in the Hexapla). The saying of Jesus will be found in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 10:

> οὐ γὰρ φθονῶν, φησί, παρήγγειλεν ὁ Κύριος ἔν τινι εὐαγγελίῳ, Μυστήριον ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου.

and in Clem. *Hom.* xix. 20:

> Μεμνήμεθα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκάλου, ὡς ἐντελλόμενος ἡμῖν εἶπεν· Τὰ μυστήρια ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς μου φυλάξατε.

Such a saying cannot have had a baptismal reference in the first instance, however much it may have lent itself to such use in later days.

We may also compare Lactantius, *Instit.* vii. 26, which has much similarity with the language of the Ode:

> 'Nos defendere hanc (doctrinam) publice atque asserere non solemus, Deo iubente, ut quieti ac silentes arcanum eius in abdito atque intra nostram conscientiam teneamus, ... abscondi enim tegique mysterium quam fidelissime oportet, maxime a nobis, qui nomen fidei gerimus.'

Wensinck, in his recent translation of the *Dove* of Bar Hebraeus, has some excellent remarks upon mystical reticence, but does not see that in the following passage Bar Hebraeus is quoting from Isaiah:

> 'The Holy Scripture says concerning them; there is a secrecy between me and my house-mates; and it warns them not to publish

Digitized by Google

these things, but to conceal them, and it does not allow the house-mates to scrutinize them, save only in oral discussion.'[1]

An acquaintance with mystical language and esoteric teaching makes it clear that the injunction in the Odes has nothing to do with baptismal ritual.

It is to be noted, however, that in *Pistis Sophia* 377 the rule is applied to baptism : e.g.

> 'Occulite hoc μυστήριον, ne date id homini cuivis, εἰ μήτι facturo res omnes, quas dixi vobis in meis ἐντολαῖς. Hoc οὖν est μυστήριον ἀληθείας βαπτίσματος horum qui remittent eorum peccata.'

Here the actual reference, and the allusion to Matt. xxviii, show that baptism is the mystery that is to be concealed.

In this Ode and in the next there is an allusion to a state of War from which the saints either have been delivered or may expect to be. We put the two passages side by side for comparison :

Ode viii. 7.	Ode ix. 6.
Peace hath been prepared for you, Before ever your war happened.	For I announce peace to you His saints ; That none of those who hear may fall in war.

It is hard to say what the war and the peace are to which the Odist refers. It is very difficult to limit the language to purely spiritual conflicts, or to assume that it only means that the saints shall get the victory : but at the end of the ninth Ode he seems to say that 'Victory is yours', and that this victory is due to the inscription of the names of the faithful in a book of life.

In the eighth Ode the saints have gone through a variety of conflicts : they have been brought low, put to silence, despised. Some struggle has evidently gone on, which is not covered by the individual conflict for inward illumination and liberty. But what the battle is we have no means of determining, nor with whom.

As the Odist goes on in verse 9 to describe a crown of precious stones about which wars have arisen, we must probably refer these wars to the one mentioned in verse 7. The crown, however, is the Truth, just as it is in Ode i, where no wars are mentioned. This suggests that after all the reference is to spiritual conflicts. The statement that 'righteousness has

[1] Wensinck, *l.c.*, p. xxviii.

Digitized by Google

taken it and given it to you', would mean, 'the crown is yours as the Victor's right'. There is, however, still much that is obscure in the Odist's language.

Reviewing the whole Ode we see very definite traces of Syriac influence. The assonances in verse 12 ('understand my knowledge', &c.) should be noted, also the reference in verse 21 to Isa. lviii. 8, which is quoted again in Ode xx, where see the argument that the prophet is being quoted from the Syriac. The sentence

'They shall not be deprived of my Name,
For it is with them,'

is to be understood as a Targum substitution of the Name for the Person, so that it really means,

'They shall not be without me,
For I am with them.'

This is the Odist's way of working over Isa. lviii. 9:

'Thou shalt cry,
And He shall say, Here I am.'

ODE IX

1 Open your ears;
And I will speak to you.

2 Give me your souls;
That I may also give you my soul.

3 The Word of the Lord and His good pleasures,
The holy thought that He has thought concerning His Messiah.

4 For in the will of the Lord is your life;
And His intention is (your) everlasting life;
And your end[1] is incorruptible.

[1] *Or*, your perfection.

Digitized by Google

5[a] Be enriched in God the Father,
And receive the intention of the Most High;
5[b] Be strong and be redeemed by His grace.

6 For I announce peace, to you His saints;
That none of those who hear may fall in war.

Cf. John iii. 16.
Cf. Isa. xxviii. 16.

7 And that those who have known Him may not perish,
And that those who receive (Him) may not be ashamed.

Ps. xx. (xxi.) 4.

8 An everlasting crown is Truth;
Blessed are they who set it on their heads:

Ps. xx. (xxi.) 4 (LXX).

9 A stone of great price (it is);
And the wars were on account of the crown.

10 And righteousness hath taken it,
And hath given it to you.

11 Put on the crown in the true covenant of the Lord;
And all those who have conquered shall be inscribed[1] in His book.

12 For their inscription[2] is the victory, which is yours;
And she (Victory) sees you before her, and wills that you shall be saved.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 7. Gressmann suggests ܕܢܒܗܬܝܢ for ܕܢܒܗܬܘܢ. The meaning of both is identical and the change is possible but not necessary. The case would be similar if we proposed to substitute for it the verb ܕܢܬܒܗܬܘܢ as Wellhausen has done. Cf. Ode xix. 5, &c.

[1] *Lit.* booked. [2] *Lit.* book.

v. 11. Flemming's suggestion of ܫܪܪܐ 'truth' for ܫܪܝܪܐ 'true', 'firm', the adjective referring to covenant, is not sound.

v. 12. It is possible to read with Frankenberg ܕܠܟܘܢ 'your' for ܕܠܟܘܢ 'to you'.

The important verses in this Ode from a critical point of view are verses 8–11, in which Truth is spoken of as an everlasting crown and a crown of victory to be placed on the head of the believer. The Odist makes an apparent discontinuity of expression by saying (1) that Truth is a crown; (2) that this crown is a stone of great price. The discontinuity disappears when we observe the source from which the writer is working: it is the LXX rendering of Ps. xx. (xxi.) 4:

ἔθηκας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ στέφανον ἐκ λίθου τιμίου.

Here the 'precious stone' is an attempt to translate the perplexing פז of the Hebrew, which in the English Bible appears as 'pure gold'. Our Odist has in his presentation of the Hebrew treated 'the precious stone' as an apposition to the 'crown'. In his translation by 'precious stone' he follows the LXX very closely, and it is to be observed that this is *not* the reading of the Peshiṭta, which says 'a glorious crown'. This is the more curious; because the Peshiṭta when it translates מן זהב ומפז רב in Psalm xviii. (xix.) 10 renders by ܡܢ ܕܗܒܐ ܘܡܢ ܟܐܦܐ ܝܩܝܪܬܐ ('of gold and precious stones'). We cannot, therefore, be sure that there is no influence from the Peshiṭta on the Ode.

Expository Notes.

We referred in the previous Ode to the prevalence or possibility of a state of war that may affect the saints, and which occurs in this Ode also. The Ode is spoken by the poet as prophet or orator. The reference to 'those who hear' (i.e. 'you who hear') depends on verse 1, 'open your ears'.

This Ode is one of the group of coronation Odes mentioned under the first Ode. It is a royal crown in one point of view, for the language is borrowed from Ps. xx. (xxi.), in which it is said in the opening verse: 'the King shall joy in thy strength, O God'. The crown is, then, the King's, and apparently the Odist regards the Psalm as Messianic, with

Digitized by Google

Christ for King; it can thus be described as 'the holy thought which God has thought concerning his Christ'. The Odist also describes the Crown as a Victor's crown, so that this Ode does not come under the description of epithalamium. It certainly is not the baptismal circlet which is described in these terms.

The reference to the 20th Psalm will help us to explain not only the 'crown' and the 'King Messiah', but the apparently irrelevant verse 4:

> 'The Lord's intention is everlasting life,
> Your end is incorruption.'

For this Psalm was in very early times taken as predictive of immortality, not only of the King, who asks life and gets it, but also of the believer. Irenaeus has a special section, in which he discusses the question how souls, which admittedly have a beginning, can become incorruptible:

quomodo animae cum sint generabiles in futurum incorruptibiles perseverant.

Amongst the considerations which he adduces are the following:

> Ps. xx. (xxi.) 4. Et iterum de salvando homine sic ait; *Vitam petit a te et tribuisti ei longitudinem dierum in saeculum saeculi.*—Iren. (ed. Mass. 169).

Here then the Psalm in question is applied to man generally; and to establish the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. But this is not all that we learn from Irenaeus. He not only proves immortality of the soul from the Scripture, but he argues it as follows. Immortality is not natural: it is the gift of the Father and the gift of grace:

> 'Tanquam *Patre* omnium *donante* et in saeculum saeculi perseverantiam *his qui salvi fiunt*: non enim in nobis, neque ex nostra natura vita est; sed secundum Dei gratiam datur.'

This is exactly what the Odist has been saying; the obscurity of whose sentences and sequences disappears when we put the passage of Irenaeus alongside with them. Both of them are trying to say on the basis of the 20th (21st) Psalm that the gift of God is eternal life: the immortality of the soul is in the will of the Father by His grace.

It appears, then, that the ninth Ode of Solomon is based on the 20th Psalm of David. From this Psalm comes the Christ, the gift of immortality, and the crown of precious stones. The discovery is an

Digitized by Google

important one, for we had already shown that the first Ode was a pendant to the first Psalm; now we say that the ninth Ode is a pendant to the 21st Psalm. We shall come across more cases presently of the dependence of the Odist upon the Psalter: the 28th Ode, for example, will require the 22nd Psalm for its key; and so, no doubt, in other cases. We may not be able to generalize the dependence into a formula: but it is at least conceivable that just as Bardaisan made a Psalter of 150 Psalms in imitation of the Davidic collection, so we have a similar practice on the part of the Odist, though we may not know how far the imitation goes.

The identification of the underlying Psalm may help us to a conjectural solution of the wars that issue in peace to which we alluded above. Is it not possible that the writer is simply affirming the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, who will attain peace after the wars of this life? This would explain the sequence:

> 'that none of those who hear may fall in the war:
> And that those who have known Him may not perish,
> And that those who receive Him may not be ashamed.'

ODE X

1 The Lord hath directed my mouth by His Word;
And He hath opened my heart by His Light.

2 And He hath caused to dwell in me His deathless life;
And gave me to speak the fruit of His peace:

3 To convert the souls of those who are willing to come to Him; Cf. Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 18.
And to lead captive a good captivity for freedom.

(Christ speaks.)

4 I was strengthened and made mighty and took the world captive;
And (the captivity) became to me for the praise of the Most High and of God my Father.

Digitized by Google

5 And the Gentiles were gathered together who had been
scattered abroad:
And I was unpolluted by my love (for them),
Because they confessed[1] me in high places.

6 And the traces of the light were set upon their hearts;
And they walked in my life and were saved,
And they became my people for ever and ever.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. Instead of 'hath directed' we may also translate 'hath rectified'. The verb ܬܪܨ has always more the meaning of 'rectification' than of 'direction'.

v. 5. The MS. has the two dots of the plural on ܒܚܘܒܝ 'by my love', and this gives 'by my sins', which may be found in harmony with the preceding verb, 'I was un-polluted'. The application of this meaning to Christ does not seem to be very suitable, and consequently we have suggested the elimination of the siamē points, and translated 'by my love'. We might, in accordance with Ode viii. 22, read ܒܚܒܝܒ̈ܝ 'in my beloved ones', but this is a violent emendation. Barnes suggests ܒܚܘܒ̈ܝܗܘܢ 'by their sins'. In the following line, Gunkel proposes without necessity ܒܡܥܡܘܪ̈ܐ for ܒܡܪ̈ܘܡܐ.

v. 6. The word ܥܡܝ might be translated 'my people' from ܥܡܐ, and might also be taken as the preposition ܥܡ and be translated 'with me', 'and they became with me for ever and ever'.

Expository Notes.

In this Ode again the writer, after a short preface in which he declares himself an evangelist of the new faith, begins to speak in the Person of Christ and so continues to the end of the Ode.

The chief point to be noticed in this little Ode is the allusion to the conversion of the Gentiles. The language is apologetic. Their presence in the Church has not polluted the Christ, whose love had won them. The sympathy with the Gentiles is touched with irony of a delicate kind

[1] *Or,* gave thanks to.

Digitized by Google

towards those who thought them a pollution. The Gentiles are still somewhat on sufferance, shall we say at Antioch? The language does not seem to belong to a late period of ecclesiastical growth; the Scriptures, too, which underlie the statements of the Odist are either Old Testament passages which are already in use in the New, or, which is much the same thing, extracted from early collections of *Testimonia*. The 'leading captive captivity' is Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 18, and is in use in Eph. iv. 8. The Gentiles who *confess* Christ should be understood in the sense of ἐξομολογοῦνται (as in Ode v. 1); and the underlying Scripture is Ps. xvii. (xviii.) 50, where the Psalmist, speaking in his own person at the end of the Psalm says

ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν, Κύριε·

The testimony is known to us from Rom. xv. 9, where it is introduced as follows:

> 'And that *the Gentiles* should glorify God for His mercy, as it is written, I will give thanks to thee among the Gentiles and will sing Psalms in thy name.'

Here St. Paul treats the ancient Psalmist as a representative Gentile. That the Gentiles should become 'my people' is from Hosea (ii. 23):

καλέσω τὸν οὐ-λαόν-μου λαόν-μου· καὶ τὴν οὐκ-ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην.

a testimony which appears in Rom. ix. 25 and in 1 Pet. ii. 10, and in *Testimonies against the Jews* (e.g. Cyp. *Test.* i. 19).

For the 'traces' or 'footprints' of the Light, see Ode vii.

ODE XI

1 My heart was cloven and its flower appeared;
And grace sprang up in it;
And it brought forth fruit to the Lord.

2 For the Most High clave (my heart) by His Holy Spirit,
And exposed towards Him my affection.[1]
And filled me with His love.

[1] *Lit.* reins.

Digitized by Google

3 And His cleaving of (my heart) became my salvation,
And I ran in the way, in His peace,
In the way of truth.

4 From the beginning and even to the end
I received His knowledge.

Cf. Aphrahat i. 416. 5 And I was established upon the rock of truth,
Where He had set me up.

6 And speaking waters drew near my lips
From the fountain of the Lord plenteously.

7 And I drank and was inebriated
With the living water that doth not die;
Cf. Ephes. v. 17, 18. 8a And my inebriation was not one without knowledge,
8b But I forsook vanity:
9 And I turned to the Most High my God,
And I was enriched by His bounty;

10 And I forsook the folly cast away over the earth;
And I stripped it off and cast it from me.

Cf. Ps. civ. (ciii.) 2. 11 And the Lord renewed me in His raiment,
And possessed me by His light;

12 And from above He gave me rest without corruption;
And I became like the land which blossoms and rejoices in its fruits:

13 And the Lord (was) like the sun (shining) upon the face of the land;

14 My eyes were enlightened,
And my face received the dew:

Digitized by Google

15 And my nostrils had the pleasure
Of the pleasant odour of the Lord.

16 And He carried me into His Paradise,
Where is the abundance of the pleasure of the Lord;

17 And I worshipped the Lord on account of His glory;

18 And I said, Blessed, O Lord, are they
That are planted in thy land,
And that have a place in thy Paradise,

19 And that grow in the growth of thy trees; Cf. Ps. Sol. xiv. 2.
And have changed from darkness to light.

20 Behold! all thy servants are fair,
They who do good works,
And turn away from wickedness to thy pleasantness.

21 And they have turned away from themselves the bitterness of the trees, Cf. Ephr. (*R.E.* iii. 588).
When they were planted in thy land.

22 And everything became like a remembrance of thyself,
And a memorial for ever of thy faithful servants.

23 For there is abundant room in thy Paradise;
And nothing is useless therein: Ephr. (*R.E.* iii. 584).
But everything is filled with fruit; Cf. 2 Pet. i. 8.

24 Glory be to thee, O Lord, the delight of Paradise for ever.
Hallelujah.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

vv. 1–2. The verb which we have translated by 'to cleave' is used generally by Syrian writers in the sense of 'to circumcise'. Perhaps this 'double entente' was in the writer's or translator's mind. It would lower the Ode to try to reproduce such a nuance in English. The circumcision of heart, spoken of in the Old Testament is found even in the Ḳur'ān, ii. 82, iv. 154, and is frequent in Syriac literature in general: (e. g. Ephr. *R.E.* iii. 188).

v. 2. Tondelli's suggestion that instead of the primitive form ܟܠ we should read ܟܠܢ is possible but not necessary.

v. 6. Bruston's hypothesis that instead of ܡܠܠܐ we should resort to an adjective formed of the verb ܡܠܐ 'to fill' is not probable.

v. 11. Frankenberg proposes to read ܘܚܣܢܝ 'and He pitied me' for ܘܚܝܢܝ.

v. 14. The verb ܐܢܗܪ may be taken transitively, i.e. (God) 'illuminated my eyes', or intransitively, 'my eyes were enlightened, illuminated'. (Cf. iv. 4.)

v. 16. Grimme unnecessarily suggests that the word ܕܡܕܢܚܐ of this verse and the word ܒܐܘܪܚܐ of verse 3 are a dittographical error of the copyist.

v. 23. The passage, as has been pointed out in the Introduction, has been quoted by Ephrem (*Opp.*, ed. Rom. iii. 584) as follows:

ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬ ܡܕܡ ܬܡܢ ܕܒܛܝܠ ܗܘ

'for there is nothing there that is vain (*or* useless)';

he was speaking of Paradise, and the quotation is unmistakable.

As it stands we must translate:

'Glory to thee, O God, the delight of Paradise for ever.'

If, however, we imagine ܠܘܬܟ to have dropped after ܐܠܗܐ we have:

'Glory to thee, O God; *with thee* is the delight of Paradise for ever.'

This is very near to the Targum of Psalm xvi. 11:

בסימתא בימינך לעלמין

'In thy right hand is delight for ever.'

The Targum is like the Odist in his fondness for introducing the delight of Paradise. In the 90th Psalm, at the end, he paraphrases the expression

'Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us',

and says:

'Let the delight of the Garden of Eden be upon us before the Lord.'

Digitized by Google

Expository Notes.

This lovely Psalm was known to Ephrem, as we have shown in one of our introductory chapters, and perhaps also to Ignatius and Barnabas. For the inebriation which is caused by the living water we may compare Cyril of Jerusalem:

> 'They are drunken, yet sober . . . a drunkenness contrary to that of the body; for this last even causes forgetfulness of what was known.'—Cyril, *Cat.* xvii. 19.

Cyril is speaking of the gift of the Spirit, from the day of Pentecost onwards, but he discloses the origin of his own language as to the God-intoxicated folk, and incidentally the origin of the language of the Odist; for he refers to Psalm xxxv (xxxvi):

> μεθυσθήσονται ἀπὸ πιότητος τοῦ οἴκου σου·
> καὶ τὸν χειμάρρουν τῆς τρυφῆς σου ποτιεῖς αὐτούς·
> ὅτι παρὰ σοὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς. (Targ. 'drops of living water'.)
> Ps. xxxv. (xxxvi.) 9, 10.

Here we have clearly the key to the Odist's expressions; here is the fountain of the Lord of which the believer drinks plenteously, and here is the divine intoxication.

We should compare the Odist's treatment of the Psalm with a similar passage in the 28th Ode. Here we have as follows:

> 'I have been set on his immortal pinions;
> And deathless life embraced me
> And gave me to drink;
> And from that life is the spirit within me,
> And it cannot die, for it lives.'

Here again we are in dependence on the Psalm, and the previous verse has been imitated,

> οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν σκέπῃ τῶν πτερύγων σου ἐλπιοῦσιν.

We have restored in the comparison the reading of the *editio princeps*; 'gave me to drink' corresponds to ποτιεῖς αὐτούς of the Psalm. Both of the Odes in question then go back to the same Psalm.

Digitized by Google

In verses 4, 5 the Odist has been imitating *Sap. Sol.* vi. 22:

'I will trace her [sc. Wisdom] *from the beginning* of Creation,
And bring *the Knowledge of her* into clear light;
And I will not pass by *the truth.*'

v. 13. The comparison of the Lord to the Sun and its shining, although altogether Biblical, appears to have been resented by Ephrem, who attacked Bardaisan for comparing God the Father to the Sun, e.g.

ܒܫܡܫܐ ܡܬܠ ܠܐܒܐ

('He compared the Father to the Sun').—Eph. *R.E.* ii. 558.

This eleventh Ode has in it elements that lend some support to Dr. Bernard. Here are traces of the garment of light, of the dew of the Lord, and the delight of Paradise, as well as, perhaps, an allusion to the new circumcision. It is difficult, however, to bring a spiritual Ode like this within the terms of ritual. Even if some of the terms are baptismal, the Odist is not detained by them. The language is ecstatic, and the writer confesses to spiritual intoxication. At the close he finds God everywhere, and exults in the discovery. Here we may add a couple of modern statements that come near to the thought of the Odist: the first is from Charles Kingsley:

> 'Everything seems to be full of God's reflex, if we could but see it. Oh! how I have prayed to have the mystery unfolded at least hereafter: to see, if but for a moment, the whole harmony of the great system.'—*Letters*, p. 28.

The other is from a little-known Quaker Journal, the writing of Thomas Story:

> 'Come sing with me, O ye Valleys, and Flowers of the Plain, let us clap our hands with Joy: for the King of the East hath visited us, and smiled on our Beauty: for He sees His Holy Name on every Flower, and glorious Image on every lovely Plain.'—Story, *Journal*, p. 18.

It will be convenient to add at this point the references to the 'talking water' of Daphne, which Lightfoot depreciated, in his desire to find a quotation from the Fourth Gospel in the Ignatian Epistles. Lightfoot quotes from Jortin (*Eccl. Hist.* i. 356) the reference to Anacreon 11 (13):

δαφνηφόροιο Φοίβου λάλον πίοντες ὕδωρ·

for the expression 'talking water', and for the prophetic inspiration that

Digitized by Google

was supposed to be produced by drinking it: but objects to Jortin's inference that, as there was one of these 'speaking' fountains at Daphne, the famous suburb of Antioch, Ignatius may have borrowed his image from thence. Lightfoot thinks the reference doubtful, even if the text of Ignatius *ad Rom.* 7 ὕδωρ ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν were correct. Lightfoot was quoting Jortin by way of Jacobson. A reference to Jortin himself shows that Lightfoot has not done justice to Jortin, whose statement of the case for λαλοῦν and against ἀλλόμενον is admirable.

Jortin says:

'The expression ὕδωρ λαλοῦν resembles the *vocales undae* which inspired the poets and prophets, e.g.

Et de Pieriis vocalem fontibus undam.—Statius, *Silv.* i. 2. 6.

An oracle of Apollo Delphicus given to Julian, and preserved in Cedrenus,

> Εἴπατε τῷ βασιλεῖ, χαμαὶ πέσε δαίδαλος αὐλά·
> οὐκέτι Φοῖβος ἔχει καλύβαν, οὐ μαντίδα δάφνην,
> οὐ παγὰν λαλέουσαν, ἀπέσβετο καὶ λάλον ὕδωρ
> . . . .

In these verses, which, to do them justice, are elegant, Apollo, to raise Julian's compassion, deplores the silence of his oracles and *speaking streams*. In the first line read βασιλῆι.

Anacreon xiii.

> Οἱ δὲ Κλάρου παρ' ὄχθαις
> δαφνηφόροιο Φοίβου
> λάλον πιόντες ὕδωρ
> μεμηνότες βοῶσιν.'

Jortin then proceeds to discuss the passage in Ignatius and its variant readings; he shows that the Greek Menaeum had both readings, and goes on to say against Le Clerc that 'the λαλοῦν ὕδωρ must not be altered; it is sufficiently confirmed by the quotations of Cotelier in this very note where he is inclined to reject it, and it is more elegant and proper than Le Clerc imagined'. References to Antioch and Daphne follow.

It is important, both for the criticism of the Ignatian Epistles and of the Odes, that the misleading argument of Lightfoot should be set on one side. When this is done, we have an important clue for locating the Odes as well as the Ignatian Epistles in contact or connexion with Antioch.

Digitized by Google

ODE XII

1 He hath filled me with words of truth,
That I may speak the same.

2 And like the flow of waters, flows truth from my mouth,
And my lips showed forth its fruits.

Cf. Sir. xxiv. 3.
3 And it has caused its knowledge to abound in me,
Because the mouth of the Lord is the true Word,
And the door of His light;

4 And the Most High hath given Him to His Worlds.
(Worlds) which are the interpreters of His own beauty,
And the repeaters of His praise,
And the confessors of His thought,
And the heralds of His mind,
And the instructors of His works.

Cf. Sap. Sol. vii. 24.
Cf. Heb. iv. 12.
5 For the swiftness of the Word is inexpressible (?)
And like His expression (?) is His swiftness and His sharpness:
And His course has no limit.

6 Never (dóth the Word) fall, but ever it standeth;
His descent and His way are incomprehensible.
Cf. Isa. liii. 8.

7 For as His work is, so is His limit;
For He is the light and the dawn of thought.
Cf. John i. 9.

8 And by Him the worlds spake one to the other:
And those that were silent acquired speech.
Cf. Ps. xviii. (xix) 3, 4.

9 And from Him came love and concord;
And they spake one to the other what they had (to tell).

Digitized by Google

10 And they were stimulated by the Word,
And they knew Him that made them,
Because they came into concord.

11 For the mouth of the Most High spake to them;
And the interpretation of Himself had its course by Him. Cf. John i. 18.

12 For the dwelling-place of the Word is man, Cf. John i. 14.
And His truth is love.

13 Blessed are they who by it have comprehended every-
thing,
And who have known the Lord by His truth.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. Newbold suggests the elimination of the siamē points from ܡܠ̈ܬܐ and that we translate, 'The Word of Truth hath filled me that I may proclaim Him (*or* it)'. This is grammatically more correct, because it provides a subject for the first sentence, and for the second member of verse 2 (ܦܐܪ̈ܘܗܝ *His* [*or* its] fruits). Cf. also v. 3. Further, all the Ode deals with 'the Word'. The copyist was possibly puzzled, as every other Syrian Christian would be, with the fact that λόγος was expressed by the inadequate vocable ܡܠܬܐ, and put the plural dots over it, signifying that it meant 'words' *in concreto*.

v. 2. The MS. has the present tense, 'flows'; instead of ܪܳܕܶܐ of the MS. we have punctuated ܪܕܳܐ; both punctuations are used, although that of the MS. is more frequent, in the sense of 'flow', and the other is more generally said of a 'river', 'stream'.

v. 4. We have punctuated the text ܕܰܥܒ̈ܕܰܘܗܝ 'of His servants'. The MS. by putting three dots over the word instead of two, has ܕܥܒ̈ܳܕܰܘܗܝ 'of His works', which, joined with the preceding ܠܡܠܟ̈ܘܗܝ gives a better sense.

Frankenberg unnecessarily suggests to read ܡܦܫܩܢܘܬܐ in singular with

reference to λόγος. In the first line Bruston proposes to read ܠܥܠܝܡܘܗܝ 'to His young men' for ܠܥܠܡ̈ܘܗܝ. This, however, is not probable.

v. 5. Barth and Connolly have rightly pointed out that the translation of ܕܠܐ ܬܘܥܝܐ by 'inexpressible' or 'indescribable' was not warranted in Syriac, but that it meant, according to the first scholar, 'ohne Erzählung' (Ps. xix. 4). If 'inexpressible' or 'indescribable' was intended, we should have had ܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܢܐܝܬ or simply ܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܐ. The text of this verse is certainly corrupt, because (1) it is said that the 'swiftness' of the Word is *without* ܬܘܥܝܐ, and, immediately after, 'swiftness' is compared with that ܬܘܥܝܐ: because (2) the term of comparison, which is the word ܡܪܗܒܘܬܗ 'His swiftness' is repeated again in the enumeration of the two things with which it is compared, which are 'swiftness' and 'sharpness'. The copyist himself was so bewildered with an incomprehensible text that he puts the dots of the feminine over the suffixes of all the words, and as we shall see in the note to verse 7, he was even undecided between ܣܘܒܐ and ܣܘܟܐ. Our resort to a Greek ἀνεκδιήγητος as an original of ܕܠܐ ܬܘܥܝܐ cannot (any more than the Syriac text) account for these difficulties.

The only way of escape would, perhaps, be to resort to the probable hypothesis that a dittographical error from the copyists has crept into the text of the second line; on this hypothesis the text and the translation would run:

ܡܪܗܒܘܬܗ ܓܝܪ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܘܥܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇: ܘܐܝܟ
ܡܪܗܒܘܬܗ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܦ ܚܪܝܦܘܬܗ: ܘܠܐ ܣܘܟܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܗܠܟܬܗ.

'The swiftness of the Word is without record;
And like His swiftness so also is His sharpness,
And His walk (course) is without limit.'

To establish the parallelism the words ܠܐ ܬܘܥܝܐ might be changed into the natural ܠܐ ܬܚܘܡܐ 'without circumscription', so that the verse should be: 'The swiftness of the Word is without circumscription'.

In the second line Gressmann suggests that we should read ܐܝܟ ܬܢܢܐ for ܘܐܝܟ ܬܘܥܝܐ, as rendering the ἀτμίς of *Sap. Sol.* vii. 25. The term ἀτμίς is not infrequently used of the Logos in the early patristic writings, which is identified with the Sophia of the seventh chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon. The influence of the chapter in question upon our Ode appears to be very decided: here we find the epithet ὀξύ for the 'sharpness of the Word', while its 'swiftness' and its 'illimitable course' are a

Digitized by Google

reflection from the Wisdom that 'moves more rapidly than any motion, and passes and penetrates through all things' (*Sap. Sol.* vii. 24), so that an allusion to the ἀτμίς in verse 25 would be quite appropriate.

v. 6. We have suggested in a note to read ܦܬܝܗ ('His breadth'); but there is no need to make the change: ܢܚܬ is used of the Logos in Incarnation several times in the Odes; so we read 'His descent'.

For similar reasons there is no need to emend ܐܘܪܟܗ ('His length') for ܐܘܪܚܗ ('His way').

v. 7. The MS. seems to have ܣܘܟܝܗ. Possibly the copyist was perplexed between ܣܘܟܗ 'His expectation' and ܣܝܟܗ 'His limit'; or possibly he was writing ܣܘܟܗ and under the influence of the above ܣܝܟܐ another *yodh* slipped in before the *waw*.

v. 8. Our rendering is the only meaning the Syriac sentence can have.

v. 10. We have suggested in the text ܘܐܙܕܕܩܘ for ܘܐܙܕܩܠܘ; 'and they were justified' for 'and they were stimulated', 'goaded'; this is possibly a daring emendation in view of the fact that in the previous lines mention is made of the 'sharpness' of the word. Labourt's opinion that ܘܐܙܕܩܠܘ 'est une observation marginale qui se rapportait primitivement à l'état du ms.' is improbable.

v. 11. 'its course (*lit.* it proceeded) by Him'; perhaps we have here the translation of the Greek ἐν ἐκείνῳ, *sc.* τῷ λόγῳ.

Expository Notes.

This Ode is a Hymn concerning the Divine Logos, or the Divine Wisdom which becomes the Logos. It is not an easy Ode to translate nor to understand. It comes very close in one sentence to the Gospel of John, 'the dwelling-place of the Word is Man'. This is very near to the statement that the 'Logos dwelt among us', but does not involve the personal incarnation nor the assumption of flesh. It may be related to the doctrine in the Wisdom of Sirach that the Divine Wisdom found her dwelling place in Jacob and at Jerusalem. This same chapter (Sap. Sirach, xxiv) helps to explain the opening sentences about the 'Mouth of the Lord, the true Word', for here Wisdom is made to say that she 'came forth from the mouth of the Most High'.

The writer appears also to be drawing on a number of Sapiential terms which occur in the seventh chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon,

Digitized by Google

where the sharpness, force, and swiftness of the Word are described. Certainly the Ode must be grouped with the rest of the Wisdom Odes; when taken together they will do much to furnish us with the theology of the writer.

In verse 6 there is some obscurity in the statement that 'His descent and His way are incomprehensible'. If the writer means to describe in these words the appearance of the Logos among men, we have probably a reaction from the verse in Isaiah liii, 'Who shall declare His generation?' a passage commonly used by the early Fathers to show that the Birth of Christ is ἀνεκδιήγητος.

In verses 3, 11 we have allusions to Wisdom as being the *Mouth of the Lord*, or the *Mouth of the Most High*, which are parallel to the language of Sirach xxiv. 3 sqq. We compare Ode xii. 3:

ܡܛܠ ܕܦܘܡܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܫܪܝܪܐ

and Ode xii. 11:

ܡܛܠ ܕܡܠܠ ܠܗܘܢ ܦܘܡܗ ܕܡܪܝܡܐ

with Sirach xxiv. 3:

ἐγὼ ἀπὸ στόματος Ὑψίστου ἐξῆλθον·

The Peshiṭta of Sirach has ܕܥܠܝܐ, where again we see the Odist to be independent of the Peshiṭta. The whole of Ode XII is a Wisdom composition, showing striking parallelism with the *Praises of Wisdom* in Sirach xxiv.

ODE XIII

Cf. Sap. Sol. vii. 26.
Cf. Ephr. *Hymn. in Fest. Epiph.* i. 93 also *R.E.* ii. 511–13.

1 Behold! the Lord is our mirror:
Open your eyes and see them in Him.

2 And learn the manner of your face;
And tell forth praises to His Spirit:

Cf. Ephr. *Hymn. in Ecclesiam* iv. 602.
Cf. Sap. Sol. vii. 26.

3 And wipe off the filth from your face;
And love His holiness and clothe yourselves therewith:

4 And you will be without stain at all times with Him.
Hallelujah.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 1. Frankenberg and Preuschen have made the suggestion that we should translate 'see yourselves in Him', on the supposition that a primitive Greek ἑαυτούς or αὐτούς has been misunderstood by the translator, who took the word to refer to the 'eyes' and not to the persons who were using the eyes. The point deserves a careful consideration; in Ode xv. 3 special importance is attached to eyes.

v. 2. Gressmann unnecessarily changes ܠܪܘܚܗ 'to His Spirit' into ܠܐܘܚܗ 'to His Herrlichkeit'.

v. 3. The MS. seems to have the meaningless ܕܝܡܬܐ. Its correction into ܕܘܒܬܐ is almost certain. The root being ܕܐܒ with a guttural *hamza*, phonetically it is more correct to read ܕܐܒܬܐ, but it is a well-known fact that the sound *hamza* is frequently softened into a weak letter.

Expository Notes.

This little Ode, like the preceding one, is Sapiential in character: the 'mirror' which the Lord is declared to be, is the 'unspotted mirror of the operation of God' in the seventh chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon. We have shown in the introductory chapters how familiar Ephrem was with this Ode, and how he manipulated it into liturgical language. If we keep the Sapiential language before our mind, we shall see the meaning of the close of the Ode as well as its opening: the believer, who clothes himself with the Divine Holiness, becomes also a spotless person (ἀκηλίδωτος), and is enjoined to be 'without stain' at all time before Him.

In the *Acts of John* there is a curious hymn sung by the Apostle to his disciples before his apprehension; at the close of the hymn, which seems to belong to Christ speaking in him, we read

> 'I am a Lamp to him that sees me:
> I am a Mirror to him that considers me:
> I am a Door to him that knocks to me:
> I am a Way to thee the passer by.'

Here the 'Mirror' is accepted as one of the titles of Jesus; so it seems that this Ode also passed into Gnostic hands, in the form in which we

Digitized by Google

know it. It would be a great mistake to call the Ode itself Gnostic: it is a clear and beautiful call to a redeemed and Christ-like life.[1]

Another parallel to the Lord being our mirror is *I. Ep. Clem.* c. 36: 'Through Him let us look intently on the Heavenly Heights; through Him we behold as in a mirror that unblemished and most lofty visage of His; through Him the eyes of our heart were opened.' Here the parallelism is very pronounced with Ode xiii; the Lord is *the mirror*; by Him the *eyes are opened*; an *unblemished* form is perceived.

ODE XIV

Cf. Ps. cxxiii. 2.

1 As the eyes of a son to his father,
So are my eyes at all time towards thee, O Lord.

2 For with thee are my consolations[2] and my delights.

3 Turn not away thy mercy from me, O Lord:
And take not thy kindness from me.

Cf. Ps. xlviii. 15.
Cf. Ps. xxx. (xxxi.) 4.

4 Stretch out to me, my Lord, at all times, thy right hand;
And be my guide even to the end, according to thy good pleasure.

Matt. vi. 13.

5 Let me be well-pleasing before thee, because of thy glory:
And because of thy name let me be saved from the Evil One.

6 And let thy gentleness, O Lord, abide with me,
And the fruits of thy love.

7 Teach me the Odes of thy truth
That I may bring forth fruit in thee.

8 And open to me the harp of thy Holy Spirit,
That with all (its) notes I may praise thee, O Lord.

[1] The passage in the Acts of John will be found in Bonnet's ed., p. 198. We owe the reference to Stölten.

[2] *lit.* my breasts.

Digitized by Google

9 And according to the multitude of thy mercies
So shalt thou give to me:
And hasten to grant our petitions.
10 And thou art able for all our needs. Cf. Phil. iv. 19.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 5. The Syriac word ܒܝܫܐ in the text is commonly used in Syriac literature to render 'the Evil One'; 'evil' being, on the other hand, expressed by the neutral (fem.) ܒܝܫܬܐ. See also Ode xxxiii. 4.

v. 6. Frankenberg proposes to eliminate the *waw* of ܘܢܣܝܒܘܠܟ.

v. 10. Labourt suggests ܕܐܢܬ 'because thou' instead of ܘܐܢܬ 'and thou'. It is a possible but quite unnecessary hypothesis.

Expository Notes.

This Ode and the two which follow are grouped together by the similarity of their opening verses, which are in each case of the nature of a similitude. In the Ode before us, the motive is found in an imitation of the 122nd (123rd) Psalm in the canonical Psalter:

'as the eyes of servants . . .
as the eyes of a maid . . .'

The writer has also borrowed in verse 4 the language of another Psalm, Ps. xlvii. (xlviii.):

'Our God for ever and ever,
He will be our guide even unto death.'

This is one of the Odes in which the similitude of the harp is introduced: e.g. in Ode vi, the Odist is the harp, and the Spirit of the Lord speaks in his members: in Ode vii the singers go forth to welcome the Lord at His coming with the harp of many tones (κιθάρα πολύφωνος), &c. The figure is one that was used by Syriac writers both orthodox and heretical. Ephrem says of the teaching of Bardaisan and Mani that 'they saw that there is in the heart an instrument for the impulses of the soul, and that there is in the tongue a harp (ܟܢܪܐ) of speech' (ed. Mitchell, p. xc).

Digitized by Google

Cf. also (p. ciii):

> 'By the mouth of the body the soul preaches truth in the world; and it is a pure harp for it, by means of which it sounds forth truth in creation.'

In verses 4, 5 we have distinct traces of the influence of Ps. xlvii. (xlviii.) 15 and Ps. xxx. (xxxi.) 4. The Odist prays that the Lord may be his guide even to the end; he has substituted 'the end' for 'death', but agrees with the Hebrew and its dependent Peshiṭta in the use of the verb ܕܒܪ ('to guide'), while the LXX has the more remote ποιμανεῖ. After the manner of the Odist, we have in the next verse the influence of Ps. xxx. (xxxi.), '*For thy name's sake lead* me and guide me', where the Peshiṭta does not mention the idea of guidance, which is involved in the Hebrew and the LXX. Here again the Odist shows independence of the Peshiṭta tradition.

In verse 10 the Odist concludes with the sentiment that 'God is able for all our needs', which is nearly parallel to Phil. iv. 20, 'My God shall supply every need of yours'. 'Need' (χρεία) is in the Ode ܣܢܝܩܘܬܐ, in the Peshiṭta ܡܣܢܩܘܬܐ. Further, the Peshiṭta follows the Greek in rendering πληρώσει ('shall fulfil') literally, which the Odist explains in the sense of Divine ability (ܡܨܐ).

ODE XV

1 As the sun is the joy to them that seek for its daybreak
So is my joy the Lord:

2 Because He is my Sun, and His rays have lifted me up;
And His light hath dispelled all darkness from my face.

3 In Him I have acquired eyes,
And have seen His holy day:

4 Ears I have acquired,
And I have heard His truth.

Digitized by Google

5 The thought of knowledge I have acquired,
And I have been delighted by Him.

6 The way of error I have left and I went towards Him,
And I have received Salvation from Him abundantly.

7 And according to His bounty He hath given to me:
And according to His excellent beauty He hath made me.

8 I have put on incorruption through His name, 1 Cor. xv. 54.
And I have put off corruption by His grace.

9 Death hath been destroyed before my face;
And Sheol hath been abolished by my word. 1 Cor. xv. 55.

10 And there hath gone up deathless life in the Lord's land;
And it hath been made known to His faithful ones;
And hath been given without stint to all those that trust in Him.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 5. The MS. has ܘܐܬܦܨܚܬ 'I was delighted'. In view of the next verse where mention is made of salvation we have suggested the probable ܘܐܬܦܪܩܬ 'and I was saved'. The opinion of Labourt who thinks that ܒܐܝܕܗ 'by His hand' is to be attached to the following verse, becomes unnecessary.

v. 10. Schulthess suggests ܫܠܡܘ (pl.); this is very good, but not necessary; we have maintained the reading of the MS. (cf. xxxv. 3).

Expository Notes.

It was suggested in the *editio princeps* that the Odist in his opening sentences strikes the note of Psalm cxxix. (cxxx.) 6, and this is probably the case: but if so, he is not using the LXX text, which says, 'from the morning watch till night my soul hopes in the Lord'. Moreover, he has given the Psalm quite a different turn, changing the painful and prolonged sense of waiting for the dawn into a song after sunrise, out of which all sadness has disappeared.

Digitized by Google

Kleinert[1] suggested that the Ode was composed for the Sunday, as being the day of the Sun, and remarked that the Mandaeans reported the Sunday as holier (because older) than the Sabbath. He need not have gone so far as the Mandaeans, for Ignatius advises the Christians of his day not any longer to Sabbatize, but to live according to the Lord's day. Probably Kleinert was trying to explain the term 'His holy day' in verse 3. It may be doubted whether any explanation is really necessary.

It is probable that the acquaintance of Syriac writers with the Odes of Solomon can be traced through many centuries. Here, for example, is a passage which is suggestive of dependence upon the Odes in the Preface to the Marganitha or 'Pearl' of 'Abdisho'. The writer prays '*That we may be lifted up to* the Holy of Holies, the dwelling-place of the Divine mysteries, and may be transformed into that likeness which is above all likeness; and that *through the rays of thy essential light* we may shine forth for ever, *and be rejuvenated*, and may become *the companions of those who are near to thy greatness* in theory and in practice; and that we should be seen by the illustrious and blessed here and there, and amongst those who are *of the right hand*.'

It will be recognized that this passage is in close dependence upon the thoughts and expressions in the Odes. The coincidence is striking with those passages where the Odist speaks of being lifted up into Divine light (Ode xv, and Ode xxi) and becoming one of the neighbours of God (Ode xxi, and Ode xxxvi); and the allusion to believers as those who are on the right hand, is also remarkable. The language does not show the same coincidence as the thought. Instead of ܐܬܬܪܘܡ we have the equivalent ܐܬܥܠܝ, and instead of ܩܪܝܒ for neighbours we have the equivalent ܡܩܪܒܐ. But these variations do not invalidate the dependence of 'Abdisho' upon the thought of the Odist.

ODE XVI

1 As the work of the husbandman is the ploughshare;
And the work of the steersman is the guidance of the ship:
So also my work is the Psalm of the Lord in His praises;

[1] *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, p. 610.

Digitized by Google

2 My craft and my occupation are in His praises;
Because His love hath nourished my heart,
And even to my lips His fruits He poured out.

3 For my love is the Lord
And therefore I will sing unto Him.

4 For I am made strong in His praise,
And I have faith in Him.

5 I will open my mouth,
And His spirit will utter in me
The glory of the Lord and His beauty;

6 The work of His hands
And the fabric of His fingers;

7 For the multitude of His mercies,
And the strength of His Word.

8 For the Word of the Lord searches out the unseen thing, Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 10.
And scrutinizes His thought.

9 For the eye sees His works,
And the ear hears His thought.

10 It is He who spread out the earth,
And settled the waters in the sea:

11 He expanded the heavens,
And fixed the stars;

12 And He fixed the creation and set it up:
And He rested from His works.

13 And created things run in their courses,
And work their works:
And they know not how to stand (still) and to be idle.

Digitized by Google

14 And the hosts are subject to His Word.

15 The treasury of the light is the sun,
And the treasury of the darkness is the night.

16 And He made the sun for the day that it might be bright;
But night brings darkness over the face of the earth:

Cf. Ps. xix. 1.
17 And (by) their reception one from the other
They speak the beauty of God.

18 And there is nothing that is without the Lord;
Cf. Col. i. 17.
For He was before anything came into being.

Cf. Heb. i. 2.
19 And the Worlds were made by His Word,
And by the thought of His heart.

(Doxology.)

20 Glory and Honour to His name.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. Schulthess suggests ܟܪܘܗ 'the mast' for ܕܘܒܪܗ 'the steering'. This, however, is not sound. The verb ܕܒܪ is very frequently used to express 'the steering' of a ship, e.g.

ܠܠܡܐܢܐ ܕܒܪ ܡܥܒܪܢܐ (Ephr. *R.E.* i. 314).

'He steers ships to the harbour.'

Further, ܟܪܘܐ is generally used in the plural and refers to tools whose function is to strengthen the construction of a ship.

v. 2. Frankenberg unnecessarily proposes to eliminate the *beth* of ܒܬܫܒܚܬܗ.

v. 8. The verb ܕܠܠ is not duly catalogued in the *Thesaurus*, and this has given rise to many inadmissible theories about this sentence. It is, however, an obvious Syriac triliteral root with the meaning of 'to fathom, to scrutinize'. See *Dictionnaire de la langue chaldéenne*, and *Vocabulaire*

Digitized by Google

chaldéen-arabe (*sub voce*). The following quotation from Gregory of Cyprus, a fourth-century writer, is sufficient:

ܘܗܫܐ ܗܐ ܦܪ̈ܚܢ ܥܝ̈ܢܝ ܥܠ ܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܢܗܝܪ̈ܐ
ܘܕܓ̈ܠܢ ܟܠ ܡܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܫܬܐܣܝܗܘܢ ܘܐܦ ܒܥܘܡܩܝܗܘܢ ܕܬܗ̈ܘܡܐ

'And now behold my eyes fly over the countries of the luminaries, and see clearly all that is found in the bottom and in the depths of the abysses.'—MS. of the Rylands Library, p. 117.

The meaning of the word had been divined by Tondelli, who refers to Brun's *Lexicon*.

In a recent paper by Dr. P. Haupt in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (xxxvii, 1918, pp. 229–232) the Assyrian root *Dagālu*, 'to see, to look for', is discussed, and it is shown that it existed in Hebrew, and that it can be restored in Cant. v. 10 and Ps. xx. 6. It is curious that Dr. Haupt does not seem to have noticed its occurrence in the *Odes of Solomon*.

v. 9. Barth unnecessarily proposes to read ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ to make it conform with ܠܡܫܡܫܘܬܗ.

v. 15. The printed text has ܫܡܫܐ; but the MS. reads ܘܫܡܫܐ, and we should correct accordingly.

v. 17. It is more grammatical to read ܘܡܩܒܠܗܘܢ.

In the next line we have adopted in the translation ܡܡܠܠܝܢ for ܡܡܠܝܢ of the MS. The elimination of the letter *lāmadh* when reduplicated is frequent in the old manuscripts. Those who prefer the reading of the MS. will translate 'complete' or 'fulfil'.

For the understanding of the somewhat mysterious inter-reception of the sun and moon, who borrow light from one another, we must turn to the teaching of the Manichaeans and Bardaisan. In the Bardesanian tradition we certainly have an alternate reception of light between the sun and the moon: it must be admitted, however, that the Ode does not exactly say this. It says that the sun and the night receive from one another. Probably the night has displaced the moon in the sentence, 'the treasury of the darkness is the night'. If this should be contested we shall have to resort to emendation in another direction, and instead of 'and their reception' (ܘܡܩܒܠܗܘܢ) we would read (ܘܒܡܩܒܠܗܘܢ) 'and by their succession', for which we can find abundant illustrations.

Digitized by Google

Expository Notes.

This Ode again belongs to the group of Wisdom-Odes; it is occupied with the praises of the Logos as the creative and providential instrument of God. All things were made by the Logos, and He was pre-existent before creation. The language is parallel to that of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, but it also shows coincidence with Colossians, and with Hebrews: thus verse 19 'the worlds were made by His word' is almost exactly Heb. i. 2, 'by whom also He made the worlds'; verse 18, 'He was before anything came into being' is very nearly Col. i. 17, 'He is before everything'; and verse 18, 'There is nothing that is without the Lord' (he clearly means the Logos), has its analogue in John i. 3, 'Without Him was not anything made that was made'. Evidently in this Ode we see the Logos-theology in its making. Some persons will, perhaps, object and say that we see it already made. But that raises the question as to what it was made out of, and takes us back to Prov. viii. 22 ff.

In verse 17 we showed in our Introduction that the language had possibly been borrowed by Bardaisan to illustrate a curious astronomical belief that the sun and moon exchanged illumination, the sun giving light to the moon when the latter is waxing and taking it back again when it is waning. There is a possibility, therefore, of literary dependence of Bardaisan on the Odes at this point. What is curious about the use of the passage is that the Ode does not say that the sun and moon receive one from the other, but something quite different, viz., that the day and night influence one another alternately, like a pair of closely matched powers, of which now one and now the other prevails. But he has the sun to rule the day without introducing the moon to rule the night. This is not in accordance with the book of Genesis. There is, then, room for a suspicion that the moon has been got rid of by the Odist or lost from his text. If we please, we may imagine that the text originally stood:

'The treasury of the Light is the Sun;
And the treasury of the darkness is the Moon;
And He made the Sun for the day that it might be bright,
But the night brings darkness over the face of the earth:
And their reception one from the other,' &c.

Agreeably, that is, at once with the book of Genesis and with Bardaisan.

Digitized by Google

We have interpreted the expression about 'reception one from the other' in accordance with the sense put upon the words by Ephrem and Bardaisan.

In the *editio princeps* the translation was offered, that

'their alternations one to the other speak the beauty of God.'

There is evidence for such a statement by way of parallel, if the translation itself could have been justified. For instance, Eusebius, arguing the evidence for design in the universe, and the consequent necessity for a pervading Logos, says that the world cannot be a chance product to the eyes of him who *observes the alternate motions of day and night* (ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς ἀμοιβαίας ὁρῶντι κινήσεις). Probably the argument was something of a commonplace. In Victorinus's tract *De fabrica mundi* the work of the Creator in forming the sun to rule the day, and the moon to rule the night was in order that day might bring on night (*superduceret*) as a place of rest for the labours of men, aud then that day might again prevail, and thus by alternation (*alterna vice*) labour might be comforted by the rest of night, and rest again regulated by the exercise of the day'. It is natural that there should have been a stress laid upon the alternation of day and night, There is some parallelism between the language of Victorinus (based originally on Papias?) and the language of our Ode with regard to 'night bringing darkness over the face of the earth'.

In verse 17 we have made a slight emendation so as to bring out the dependence of the Odist on Ps. xviii. (xix.). 'The heavens *are telling* the glory of God'. The Odist is repeating what he said in verse 5:

'His spirit *will utter* in me
The glory of the Lord and *His beauty*.'

Here 'His beauty' is an alternative term for 'His glory'. The Odist was contemplating the 'spacious firmament' on high when he said that; for in the next verse he is imitating Ps. viii.:

'Thou hast set thy glory upon thy heavens,
When I consider thy heavens the work of thy fingers.'

Or as the Odist says (verse 6):

'The work of His hands
And the fabric *of His fingers*.'

Digitized by Google

Thus the Odist is working from these two Psalms and from the first chapter of Genesis. From this quarter also (the book of Genesis) comes the reference to God's resting from His works: the 12th verse is a reflex of Gen. ii. 8: 'He rested from all His work which God had created in the making'; notice the omission of the reference to the seventh day, and what follows as to the activity of the heavenly bodies on that day as well as on other days of the week.

In the *editio princeps* the case was stated as follows:

> 'On examining the Ode more closely we detect an unmistakable case of anti-Judaic polemic. The writer, after describing the beauty of creation, and the Lord's rest from His works, goes on to say something which shows that he does not mean to deduce the Jewish Sabbath from the statements in Genesis. "Created things *run in their courses and do their works and know not how to stand or to be idle.*" Suppose we turn to Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 22, where Justin is arguing with Trypho for the non-necessity of circumcision and the Sabbath; "I will declare to you, and to those who wish to become proselytes", says Justin, "a divine word, which I heard from the old man to whom I owe my conversion. He said, 'You observe that the heavenly bodies do not idle nor keep Sabbath. Remain, therefore, as you were born; do not keep Sabbath, nor practice circumcision'".
>
> 'It is clear, then, that the 16th Ode means to say that the Sabbath is not kept by the Heavenly bodies; and as it goes on to say, "and the (Heavenly) Hosts are subject to His word" it follows that God is regulating the motions of the world on the Sabbath days as well as on the week-days: a point which Justin expressly makes in c. 29, "God undertakes the regulation of the world on this day exactly as on other days".'

To this reasoning exception was taken by Harnack, on the ground that the Odist does not say with Justin οὐκ ἀργεῖ <u>οὐδὲ σαββατίζει</u>, consequently we are not to think of anti-Judaic polemic in the Ode, which is like the rest of the collection, Jewish in character.

Suppose we ask the question how an early Christian of the type of Justin Martyr would present his case against the Jew who pointed him to the law, and emphasized its unchangeability. We naturally turn to the early collections of *Testimonies against the Jews*, to pick up the counter-quotations and the rebutting arguments. Here is an instructive passage from the section which the *Testimonies*, ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa, devote to the Sabbath.

Digitized by Google

The writer enumerates a number of cases in which the Sabbath was broken historically, or cannot be literally kept in ordinary life; and then he asks this question: 'How is it that the Sun and Moon and Stars fulfil their appointed course even on the Sabbath?'

πῶς δὲ ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἄστρα τὸν ὡρισμένον δρόμον ἐκτελεῖ καὶ τῷ σαββάτῳ;

One might almost say that the Odist and the Testimony-collector had been in collusion, so close is their agreement; it is, therefore, useless to maintain that the Sabbath was not intended by the idleness or standing still of the creation.

The argument that the Ode is Jewish and therefore could not have been spoken in an anti-Sabbatic manner, or that the Ode, not having an anti-Sabbatic sentence, must be Jewish, hardly needs further consideration.

ODE XVII

1 I was crowned by my God;
And my crown is living:

2 And I was justified by my Lord;
And my salvation is incorruptible.

3 I was loosed from vanities,
And I am not condemned.
The choking bonds were cut off by His hand[1];

4 I received the face and the fashion of a new person;
And I walked in Him and was redeemed.

5 And the thought of truth led me;
And I walked after it[2] and did not wander.

[1] *Cod.*: her hands. [2] i.e. the thought.

Digitized by Google

(Christ speaks.)

6 And all that have seen me were amazed;
And I was supposed by them to be a strange person.

7a And He who knew and brought me up,
Is the Most High in all His perfection:

7b And He glorified me by His kindness,
And raised my thought to the height of Truth.

8 And from thence He gave me the way of His steps;
And I opened the doors that were closed:

Cf. Ps. cvi. (cvii.) 16; Isa. xlv. 2.

9 And I broke in pieces the bars of iron:
But my own iron (bonds) melted and dissolved before me.

10 And nothing appeared closed to me;
Because I was the opening of everything.

11 And I went towards all the[1] bondsmen to loose them;
That I might not leave any man bound and[2] binding;

12 And I imparted my knowledge without grudging;
And their request to me[3] with my love.

13 And I sowed my fruits in hearts,
And transformed them through myself:

14 And they received my blessing and lived;
And they were gathered to me and were saved.

Cf. Ephr. *Epiph. Hymn* ix. 1.

15 Because they became to me as my own members;
And I was their head.

(Doxology.)

16 Glory to thee our Head, the Lord Messiah.

Hallelujah.

[1] H, my. [2] H, and. [3] *lit.* my request

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 4. It seems clear that we must alter ܒܐܝ̈ܕܝܗ̇ ('by her hands') to ܒܐܝܕܗ ('by his hand'). The writer seems to have thought that he was emancipated 'by the thought of Truth' (fem.) which follows in the next verse, and so added the feminine suffix.

v. 7. The Syriac sentence ܘܗܘ ܕܝܕܥ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܪܒܢܝ ܡܪܝܡܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܫܘܡܠܝܗ is difficult to understand, and in the text we have suggested that some words might have been lost after ܗܘܐ. In following H and in adding a *yodh* to ܘܐܪܒ[ܝ]ܢܝ we shall have the meaning 'But He who knew and brought me up is the Most High in all His perfection'. We could not safely take ܡܪܝܡܐ as an adjective and translate 'is high'; because, as is demonstrated by ܘܡܫܒܚ of the following line, it would have had the contracted form. Instead of ܘܡܫܒܚ 'and He is glorified', B has ܘܫܒܚܢܝ 'and He glorified me', forming possibly a parallel with ܘܐܪܒܢܝ above suggested. 'He brought me up and glorified me'. The parallelism would even be better preserved if, instead of ܘܐܪܒܢܝ we were to read ܘܐܘܪܒܢܝ 'and He exalted me', with the simple addition of an *alaph*. The sense of the whole verse would be:

> 'But He who knew and exalted me, is the Most High in all His perfection; and He glorified me by His kindness,' &c.

v. 8. There is no need to change ܕܗܒܠܬܗ into ܕܗܒܠܬܢܝ as Gunkel has done, and we do not understand the un-Syriac verb ܗܘܒܠܢܝ which Grimme substitutes for the natural ܝܗܒ ܠܝ 'He gave me'.

v. 9. Frankenberg proposes to change the particle ܕܠܝ into a form of verb derived from the verb ܕܠܐ, but Grimme substitutes for it the dative ܠܝ 'to me', and considers the first ܕܡܕܪܐ as a dittographical error on the part of the copyist.

v. 12. The sense is very doubtful. The MS. has 'and my prayer', 'request', 'intercession'. In Syriac one may consider this as the beginning of a new sentence, and in adding the attributive verb which can be omitted we would translate 'And my prayer (for them?) (is *or* was) in my love', which is not a good parallelism. We may also consider the word as a complement of ܘܝܗܒܬ 'and I gave', and translate 'And I gave them my knowledge without grudging and my prayer (*or* intercession) (for them?) in my love'. In this last meaning 'in my love'

Digitized by Google

refers to both members of parallelism, and the whole phrase means: In my love I gave them without grudging my knowledge and my intercession (*or* prayer). This last sense would be greatly improved, and all linguistic difficulty would vanish if ܒܘܝܐܐ were translated by 'consolation, comfort', as in the Lewis text of Luke ii. 25, ܘܡܣܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܘܝܐܐ ܕܐܝܣܪܝܠ ('and he was waiting for the consolation of Israel'). The meaning of the sentence would in that case be 'In my love I gave them abundantly my knowledge and my comfort'.

v. 13. This sense is by no means certain. The indirect complement of the verb ܫܚܠܦ is always expressed with ܠ like the English 'to, into', and the particle ܒ used here offers some difficulty. It is this difficulty which has no doubt caused Barth to translate 'und verwandelte sie durch mich'. It is not easy, however, to realize how the Odist would change 'through himself'. With the verb ܚܠܦ the ܒ is used to express the change of one thing *for* another, or an 'exchange', and such a meaning would not suit the context very well. Possibly, therefore, we might read the verbs ܘܙܪܥܬ and ܘܫܚܠܦܬ in the third person, and in eliminating the *waw* before ܙܪܥܬ we should have the following text and translation:

ܘܒܥܘܬܝ ܒܚܘܒܐ ܕܝܠܝ:
ܙܪܥܬ ܒܠܒܘܬܐ ܦܐܪܝ:
ܘܫܚܠܦܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܝ.

'And my prayer, by my love, sowed my fruits in hearts, and transformed them through me.'

This is grammatically and lexicographically correct, and explains also the difficulties of the preceding note.

Expository Notes.

In this Ode we have again the coronation of the Odist spoken of, with a crown that does not wither, just as in the first Ode. Also there is some confession of a personal salvation. The latter part of the Ode, however, is certainly *ex ore Christi*; we can see this from the closing doxology to 'our head, the Lord Christ', and the reference which precedes to the headship of Christ with regard to His members. Christ also is the speaker who describes himself as the 'door of everything' and the universal

Digitized by Google

liberator, and the opener of closed doors. This takes us back to the beginning of verse 9. After this we are in difficulties over the delimitation of the speakers in verses 6–8. Comparison with similar situations in Ode xxviii. 8 and Ode xli. 8 makes it probable that the person who causes amazement and appears to be of another race is Christ Himself. On this account we have put the change of speakers between verses 5 and 6. The transition, however, is very awkward.

At first sight it might seem as if the reference to the 'breaking of bars of iron' in verse 9 had to do with the descent into Hades, but it is much more probable that the language is taken from the 107th Psalm:

μοχλοὺς σιδηροῦς συνέκλασεν

the Peshiṭta version corresponding to which is

ܡܘܟ̈ܠܐ ܕܦܪܙܠܐ ܬܒܪ

and agrees exactly with the Odes; the use of *μοχλοί* (ܡܘܟ̈ܠܐ) shows that the Ode and the Peshiṭta transliterate the Greek of the Psalms.

If we have correctly defined the passage of Scripture which was in the Odist's mind, we can now go back to verse 4 with its obscure allusion to the cutting off of choking bonds: this is taken from verse 14 of the same Psalm, which runs in the Greek,

καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν διέρρηξεν·

We may compare the Syriac of the Ode at this point with the Peshiṭta:

Ode xvii. 4: ܫܝ̈ܫܠ ܐܬܦܣܩܘ ܒܐܝ̈ܕܘܗܝ

Ps. cvi. (cvii.) 14: ܘܫܝ̈ܫܠܗܘܢ ܦܣܩ

The coincidence in the rendering of *δεσμούς* and *διέρρηξεν* is very striking, and raises once more the question of possible connexion between the Odes and the Syriac Old Testament.

We may, at all events, be sure that the Odist is working from this Psalm as a base, just as we found him doing in the case of the 21st Psalm. We are entitled to explore for further coincidences.

In verse 5 the Odist says that

'the thought of Truth led me,
I walked after it and did not wander.'

Digitized by Google

This is imitated from the Psalm :

v. 4. 'They wandered in the wilderness
. . . .

v. 7. And he led them by a right way
To go to a city of Settlement.'

When the Odist says that he did not wander, he means that he did not wander again; a previous wandering is assumed as in the Psalm. And now let us compare the Ode again with the Peshiṭta version :

Ode xvii. 5 : ܘܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܕܒܪܬܢܝ

Ps. cvi. (cvii.) 7 : ܘܕܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܩܘܫܬܐ

Here we have a very curious coincidence: the 'right way' is reflected on the Ode as a 'thought' or 'counsel' of '*Truth*'; and in the Peshiṭta as a 'way of Truth', with different words to express the 'Truth'.

Whatever may be the explanation of this coincidence in thought, we may be sure we have one of the keys in our hand for the interpretation of the Ode. To the three striking coincidences already noted, we may, perhaps, add the reference to the 'loosing of all bondsmen' in verse 11, which answers to the 10th verse of the Psalm :

πεπεδημένους ἐν πτωχίᾳ καὶ ἐν σιδήρῳ·

Notice also the way in which the reference to spiritual fruits and blessing in verses 13 and 14 has been grafted on verses 37, 38 of the Psalm :

ἐποίησαν καρπὸν γενήματος
καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς.

Enough has been said to show the dependence of the Ode upon the Psalm.

In the introduction we pointed out that there were some striking parallels in this Ode to the Letter of Ignatius to the Philadelphians. We may also note the parallel (no doubt one of many similar ones) with the *Epiphany Hymns* of Ephrem :

'Ye have become children of the Holy Spirit,
(*sc.* through baptism) :
Christ has become your head ;
Ye have become members to Him.'—*Hymn in Epiph.* 9. 1.

Digitized by Google

Ephrem is imitating the 24th Ode at this point, and may have actually imitated the 17th also. We may also refer for the 'loosing of the bondmen' to Ephrem, *R. E.* iii. 130.

ODE XVIII

1 My heart was lifted up and enriched in the love of the Most High;
That I might praise Him by my name.

2 My members were strengthened
That they might not fall from His power.

3 Sickness removed from my body,
And it stood for the Lord by His will;
For His Kingdom is firm.

4 O Lord, for the sake of them that are deficient,
Do not deprive me of[1] thy word:

5 Nor, for the sake of their works,
Do thou restrain from me thy perfection.

6 Let not the luminary be conquered by the darkness; Cf. Sap. Sol. vii. 29 and John i. 5.
Nor let truth flee away from falsehood.

7 Let thy right hand bring our salvation to victory,
And receive from all quarters,
And preserve whomsoever is affected by ills.

8 Falsehood and Death are not in thy mouth, my God;
But thy will is perfection.

[1] *Lit.* Cast off from me.

Digitized by Google

9 And vanity thou knowest not,
For neither doth it know thee.

10 And error thou knowest not,
For neither doth it know thee.

11 And ignorance appeared like dust,
And like the scum of the sea:

12 And vain people supposed that it was (something) great;
And they came to resemble it and became vain:

13 And the wise understood and meditated (thereon),
And were unpolluted in their meditations;
For such were in the mind of the Lord.

14 And they mocked at those who were walking in error:

15 And on their part they spake truth,
From the inspiration which the Most High breathed into them.

(Doxology.)

16 Praise and great comeliness to His name.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. The Syriac can also be taken intransitively, 'my heart rose up and abounded in the love of the Most High'. Schulthess has suggested ܫܡܗ 'His name' instead of 'my name'; this is possible but not necessary. Still more unnecessary is its change into ܫܡܫܢܝ or ܠܫܡܢܝ or ܦܘܡܢ as Bruston has suggested.

v. 3. Diettrich suggests ܡܠܟܘܣܬܐ 'His promise is firm'. The Syriac word is, however, very seldom used. Further, the idea of the Kingdom of God being firm is expressed in Ode xxii. 12.

Digitized by Google

v. 3. B has ܘܩܡܘ 'and they stood for', referring to ܟܘܪܗܢܐ 'sicknesses'. H exhibits ܘܩܡ 'and it stood for', the subject being 'my body', which seems to be more appropriate.

v. 4. H has 'do not loose (lit. dissolve)'.

v. 7. Both MSS. have ܥܡ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ which we have changed into ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܥܡ. The note to the printed text must be changed accordingly. The meaning of the sentence is not affected by the change. If the manuscripts are right, ܥܡ is to be considered as having been used expletively, as meaning possibly, 'as if'. The reader is asked to remember that the sentence 'all affected by ills' is complement of both ܘܠܥܡܠܗܘܢ and ܘܠܐܘܠܨܢ. This disposes of some unnecessary theories about this verse. Literally ܐܚܕ ܒܒܝܫܬܐ means 'to cling to evils (or) sufferings, (or) tribulations'.

v. 10. Connolly suggests that ܐܠܐ ought to be superseded by ܐܠܗܝ 'my God'. This is good, but not necessary, inasmuch as the use or this particle here adds energy to the sentence, like the corresponding Arabic إلّا 'It is because thou knowest not error, that it does not know thee'. B omits it entirely; and for that reason it is perhaps better not to take any notice of it in the translation.

v. 12. The expression ܐܬܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܡܘܬܗ 'they came to its resemblance; they came to resemble it' simply means, 'they resembled it' in Syriac. This peculiarity of style should be noted.

Expository Notes.

This is a very difficult Ode to interpret: we have not succeeded in finding any Scripture coincidences that could be depended upon. There is a quasi-parallel to the passage in the first chapter of John ('the darkness overcame it not'). It is equally difficult to detect the Christian elements in the Ode. Perhaps the writer is speaking as a Christian in the first verse ('that I might praise Him by my name', i.e. by the name of a Christian). In that case he should be a Christian of a universal type, since he says that the Lord will 'receive men from all quarters', verse 7). We repeat what was said of this Ode in the first edition:

> 'The writer of this Psalm speaks as a prophet, who has known the Divine visitation, and has felt its effect both on mind and body, in the dispelling of error and the healing of disease. He prays for a continuance of the Heavenly gift for the sake of the needy people

Digitized by Google

to whom he gives his message. He has evidently been regarded by them as a light and foolish person, whose talk is like the foam of the sea. But there are others who are inspired like himself, and who mock at the unbelievers for their stupidity and ignorance. We catch the echo of some serious controversy upon religious matters, but the subject of the dispute is unknown.'

In verse 4 there appears to be a reflection of the 119th Psalm; we may compare:

'O Lord, for the sake of the deficient do not remove thy word from me.'
Ode xviii.

'Take not out of my mouth the word of truth utterly.'
Ps. cxix. 43.

Here the Ode says ܦܬܓܡܐ for 'word', and the Syriac says ܡܠܬܐ; but we notice that the Targum has פתגם.

In the same verse there is also a reference to Ps. li:

'Cast me not away from thy presence,
And take not thy Holy Spirit from me.'

The Nitrian MS. reads ܬܥܕܐ for ܬܥܪܐ, and this should be right; for the Syriac of Ps. li. 13 has

ܠܐ ܬܥܕܝܢܝ ܡܢ ܩܕܡܝܟ

where the Targum has a different word.

ODE XIX

1 A cup of milk was offered to me;
And I drank it in the sweetness of the delight of the Lord.

2 The Son is the cup,
And He who was milked is the Father;
And He who milked Him is the Holy Spirit.

3 Because His breasts were full;
And it was not desirable that His milk should be spilt to no purpose.

Digitized by Google

4 And the Holy Spirit opened His[1] bosom
And mingled the milk of the two breasts of the Father,

5 And gave the mixture to the world without their knowing:
And those who take (it) are in the fulness of the right hand.

6 The womb of the Virgin took (it)
And she received conception and brought forth:

7 And the Virgin became a mother with great mercy;

8ª And she travailed and brought forth a Son without incurring pain:

8ᵇ For it did not happen without purpose;

9 And she had not required a midwife, Ps. xxii. 9; and Euseb. *D.E.* x. 8, 10.
For He delivered her.

10 And she brought forth, as a man, by (God's)[2] will:
And she brought (Him) forth with demonstration
And acquired (Him) with great dignity;

11 And loved (Him) in redemption;
And guarded (Him) kindly;
And showed (Him) in majesty.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 4. Both MSS. read 'her (i.e. the Holy Spirit's) bosom' ܥܘܒܗ̇ under the influence of the preceding and following feminine verbs. We can easily read the masculine ܥܘܒܗ 'His (i.e. the Father's) bosom'.

v. 5. Grimme and Gressmann want ܠܥܠܡ̈ܐ 'to the worlds', cf. Odes vii. 11; viii. 23; xii. 4, 8; xvi. 19. The plural form of the following

[1] *Lit.* Her bosom. [2] *Or*, of her own will.

verb gives weight to their view, although, strictly speaking, grammatically it may refer also to ܠܥܠܡܐ used in the singular.

v. 6. Much has been written about the Syriac verb ܓܦܬ which *prima facie* does not seem to yield good sense. Barnes has suggested ܥܦܬ, which would answer to the problematic *infirmatus est* of Lactantius. The Syriac verb, however, is mostly used in the sense of 'to faint', 'to be exhausted from fatigue' or 'hunger'; moreover, even in accepting it in the sense of *infirmatus est*, the meaning of the sentence remains obscure. We think that the following should be accepted as a plausible interpretation. Taking the verb ܓܦ as used in the MSS., we can find in it a reduplicated root ܓܦܦ with an intransitive meaning of 'to be closed, restricted', and a concave root ܓܘܦ with a transitive meaning of 'to gather', 'to take furtively', 'to attract', 'to catch' (this last meaning is mostly used of fish). Generally speaking it is a tendency of our author to use a transitive verb without complement. The preceding verse of this Ode contains two such verbs, ܡܙܓܬ and ܝܗܒܬ. Following the same rule, we may take the verb ܓܦ in its concave form and translate: 'And those who take [it] (the mixture) are in the perfection of the right hand; the womb of the virgin caught [it], and conceived and brought forth'. Schulthess proposes ܓܦ ܠܟܪܣܐ *tetigit uterum*. This, however, would require other changes to make the Syriac correct. Labourt would suggest ܓܦ ܓܠ *alas produxit*, but besides the changes which the text would have to undergo to be grammatical, the Syriac verb is used of a bird (mostly a hen) sitting on its eggs (and seldom of its nestlings). Newbold's suggestion of ܓܒܠܘ 'they formed' is improbable. The opinion above vindicated is rightly upheld by Connolly, and grammatically and lexicographically there is little doubt that his translation is the right one. There is also reason to believe that the very verb ܓܦܬ was before the translator of the text of which Lactantius was availing himself; hence the incomprehensible *infirmatus est* derived from ܥܦܬ.

It will be seen from what precedes that we incline to believe that the correct explanation of the peculiar language of Lactantius lies in the fact that the reference made by Lactantius has come from a misunderstood Syriac text. The balance of the evidence is that way, now that we have shown that Lactantius was really giving an extract from a book of *Testimonia*. Hence there is no need to emend the text of

Digitized by Google

Lactantius from '*infirmatus* est uterus Virginis' to '*insinuatus est* uterus Virginis', on the faith of the preceding sentence in which Lactantius says: 'Descendens itaque de caelo sanctus ille spiritus sanctam virginem cuius utero se *insinuaret* elegit.'

It is, however, not a little curious that in the *Altercation of Simon and Theophilus*, which is based throughout on the traditional *Testimonia*, the very same expression turns up in an introductory sentence on the Ascension of Christ:

> 'At illi qui nesciebant Christum verbo *in virginem insinuatum*, mirantes,' &c.—*Altercatio*, c. 25.

v. 8. In the text the number 8 ought to be placed before ܘܡܚܒܠܬ, if we take ܡܛܠ of the second member as only explicative, because in this case it has to be linked with something preceding it. Labourt's opinion that this particle has here the meaning of 'eo consilio ut' is inadmissible.

v. 9. The Syriac ܘܠܐ ܒܥܬ ܚܝܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܚܝܗ̇ is curiously well worded, and the Odist seems almost to derive the verb ܐܚܝ 'to make live', to vivify, from ܚܝܬܐ 'midwife', called in Syriac 'the living one'. On this hypothesis, ܐܚܝ has certainly the meaning of 'to vivify' in the sense of to deliver a woman in travail; to facilitate her pains (cf. Exod. i. 16, 17). Generally the word is used in the Old Testament for the deliverance of children and not for that of their mother. The partisans of a Greek original might explain this happy sounding of words through a combination of *μαία* and *μαιεύομαι*, but if the Odist had in mind, when using the verb ܐܚܝ, any idea of deliverance in the sense of salvation, as implied by ܒܦܘܪܩܢܐ of verse 11, the Syriac sentence would involve a mental conception and a play upon words which could be accounted for exclusively through a Syriac channel. Otherwise we should imagine a Greek original something like the following poetical form:

καὶ οὐκ ἐμαίετο μαῖαν,
αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐμαιεύσατο αὐτήν.

v. 10. It is not certain from the context whether the virgin brought forth a child 'by *her* own will' or 'by the will of God'. Strictly speaking, the Syriac 'by will' although frequently meaning 'by one's own will' leaves the question undecided. When the word is used without suffixes,

Digitized by Google

it is an exaggeration to say that it is the natural and usual expression for 'by one's own will'. There is no linguistic reason, however, impeding us from translating it here 'by her own will'. The substantives used in the following lines with the prefix ܒ seem to refer to the Virgin, and if this be so, it is grammatically more correct to refer ܒܨܒܝܢܐ also to the same Virgin.

The Syriac construction induces us to believe that ܐܝܟ ܓܒܪܐ is to be translated by 'as if', or 'as it were a man', a rendering adopted by Labourt-Batiffol, the particle ܐܝܟ being used to mean a comparison with the reality and not the reality itself. 'As a man', or 'like a man' in the sense of 'courageously', would account for the uselessness of the midwife; but in the next verse it is stated that her Son, or more probably God Himself, took the place of a midwife. Further, this interpretation would be untenable in verses 10–11 where the word ܓܒܪܐ is almost certainly the object of all the Syriac verbs.

In the next line, the sentence ܘܝܠܕܬ ܒܬܚܘܝܬܐ translated by 'and she brought forth with demonstration' is not sufficiently clear. Linguistically, we might translate it by 'ostensibly'; in this case we should have the following meaning:

> 'She brought forth, as it were a man by (her own) will and she brought (him) forth ostensibly.'

The translation 'en exemple' adopted by Labourt is not probable; we should have had ܠܬܚܘܝܬܐ. His suggestion that the word might have been ܠܘܚܝܬܐ (*sic!*) 'hilarity' is impossible. If ܚܕܘܬܐ is meant, the change would be very violent.

Another explanation has been offered for the words 'as a man', which we shall refer to the Davidic Psalter as origin. It is suggested that instead of ܓܒܪܐ 'a man', we should read ܓܢܒܪܐ 'a giant': and there is something to be said for the suggestion.

Ephrem frequently speaks of the Virgin as bringing forth 'a giant', e.g. in the *Hymns on the Virgin*:

> 'Mary bowed down and brought forth the giant of the worlds, the giant of the powers.'

ܓܢܒܪܐ ܕܥܠܡ̈ܐ ܓܢܒܪܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܠܐ :

. . . . . .

ܡܪܝܡ ܓܚܢܬ ܘܝܠܕܬܗ.

Ed. Lamy, ii. 553.

'The womb carried thee; the manger sufficed thee;
Simeon carried thee, O giant God.'

ܟܪܣܐ ܛܥܢܬܟ܂ ܘܐܘܪܝܐ ܣܦܩ ܠܟ܂
ܫܡܥܘܢ ܛܥܢܟ܂ ܓܢܒܪܐ ܐܠܗܐ܂

Ed. Lamy, ii. 559.

'Like a child hast thou arisen from me:
And like a giant hast thou become strong.'

ܐܝܟ ܥܘܠܐ ܡܢܝ ܕܢܚܬ܂
ܘܐܝܟ ܓܢܒܪܐ ܡܬܥܫܢܬ܂

Ed. Lamy, ii. 623.

The ultimate origin of the figure, if the emendation be correct, is Ps. xix. 6: 'as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, exulting like a giant,' &c. (ܐܝܟ ܓܢܒܪܐ), or more probably Ps. lxxxvii. 5, which reads in the Peshitta Version: 'a giant man (ܓܒܪܐ ܓܢܒܪܐ) was born in her, and He established her'.

v. 11. Instead of ܒܦܘܪܩܢܐ 'with salvation', Gressmann proposes ܒܦܘܪܢܣܐ 'with administration', and (by extension) 'with care'. If an emendation is to be introduced into the text, a choice between ܒܦܘܣܩܢܐ or ܒܦܘܪܫܢܐ 'by (divine) decree' would be better Syriac.

For 'she guarded Him in kindness', we should by a slight correction, reading ܪܢܐ for ܢܛܪܐ, translate 'she crooned over Him affectionately'.

The confirmation comes from Ephrem:

'She loved Him and crooned over Him
. . . .
When He began to cry, she rose and suckled Him,
Loved Him tenderly, crooned over Him.'

ܘܡܚܒܒܐ ܠܗ ܘܡܪܢܝܐ ܠܗ܆
. . . . . .
ܘܟܕ ܕܫܪܝ ܕܢܒܟܐ
ܩܡܬ ܐܝܢܩܬܗ
ܚܒܒܬ ܪܢܬܗ܂

Ed. Lamy, ii. 553.

'She carried Him, she crooned over Him, she embraced Him.'

ܛܥܢܬ ܪܢܐ ܐܘ ܓܦܦܬ܂

Ed. Lamy, ii. 621.

'Since thou art my Son I will croon over thee; since I have become thy mother, I will honour thee.'

ܡܛܠ ܒܪܝ ܐܢܬ ܐܪܢܢܟ
ܘܗܘܝܬ ܐܡܟ ܐܝܩܪܟ.

Ed. Lamy, ii. (*ibid.*).

If this emendation be accepted, it is likely that Ephrem will take us a step further. For in the first of the passages quoted (and elsewhere), Ephrem refers to the 'swaddling clothes' and the 'manger'.

Expository Notes.

This Ode is, in modern eyes, altogether grotesque, and out of harmony with the generally lofty strain of the rest of the collection. It is not surprising that it was supposed on the first discovery of the Odes to be a later addition. Unfortunately for this hypothesis it happens to be one of the best attested; it was not only quoted by Lactantius through the medium of a primitive collection of *Testimonia*, but, as we have shown in the Introduction, it was known to Eusebius and elsewhere. So there is no ground, in our present state of knowledge, for detaching it from the rest of the collection. It stood as Ode xix in the early source to which we have traced it.

There is a further reason for not detaching it from the rest of the collection. The first half of the Ode is a parable or allegory of the milk from the breasts of God. We have already had an allusion to the divine breasts in the eighth Ode, where the Lord says 'My own breasts I prepared for them that they might drink my holy milk and live thereby'. Something to the same effect is implied in Ode xxxv:

'He gave me milk, the dew of the Lord.'

So that if the 19th Ode is to be ejected, the eighth and the 35th will have to be expelled at the same time. Moreover, if the figures employed seem harsh and unnatural to us, they do not appear to have been so to the early Christians. Clement of Alexandria, in his *Paedagogus* (lib. i, c. 8, p. 124) has a long discussion of the milk with which Christ's babes are nourished. Our nourishment, he says, is the Divine Word, it is '*the milk of the Father*, by which alone the babes are fed. Through the Word we have believed in God, *to whose care-allaying breasts* we have fled'. And again (p. 125) 'to the babes, who seek for the Word, the *breasts of the*

Digitized by Google

Father's kindness supply the milk'. Thus Clement employs the figurative language of the Ode, while avoiding its crudity.

The two parts of the Ode, the milk-section and the section on the Virgin Birth, appear to be two separate compositions on the first examination: closer study shows them to be in sequence; and the mysterious verb with which the second part of the Ode opens, being in the feminine, takes as subject the 'Spirit', the subject of the previous sentence. So the two parts were connected by the author himself.

The second part of the Ode is really more perplexing than the first: the first is grotesque, without an evolution of ideas: it might easily have been produced at a single sitting; but the second part appears to present the doctrine of the Virgin Birth in a highly evolved form; as, for instance, Virgin Birth, *plus* painlessness, *plus* non-necessity of a midwife; this is the sort of thing that we come across in the Apocryphal Gospels of the Infancy. Can we really refer this kind of speculation to the borders of the first century?

One thing has emerged clearly from the study of the Odes. We have shown in the Introduction that the Odist was not working without a Scriptural base: he was operating on the text of the 22nd Psalm, when he was talking so fantastically about the non-necessity for a midwife, and about the Father acting as midwife. This use of the 22nd Psalm is very important. In the 28th Ode the very same Psalm is applied as predictive of Christ, so that we have one more link between the 19th Ode and the rest of the collection. And it is not merely Eusebius who discloses to us the meaning of the text 'Thou art He who didst draw me out of my Mother's womb', and who uses obstetric language. The text had a place in controversy; for, as soon as the Virgin Birth was conceded, a dispute arose as to the nature of the flesh of Christ, and Valentinus enunciated the heresy that the Lord passed through the Virgin as water through a tube, without taking substance from the Virgin. So when Tertullian comes to deal with Valentinus in his treatise *De carne Christi*, he produces this very verse from the 22nd Psalm, and comments upon it with a wealth of anatomical knowledge and obstetrical detail! He uses the strongest translation possible for ἐκσπάω, and says:

> 'Avulsisti me ex utero. Quid avellitur, nisi quod inhaeret,' &c.—*De Carne Christi*, c. 20, p. 322, ed. Rigalt.

Digitized by Google

The text in the Psalm had acquired a polemical value in the Valentinian controversy, but it was a text which Valentinus himself was assumed to accept. So what seems to us to be late may turn out to be very much older than it looks. As to the painless delivery, one can find parallels to that in pagan literature; the idea, at all events, is not a Christian invention. We have discussed this obstetric matter sufficiently in the Introduction; it remains to elucidate one or two remaining points.

In verse 10 we have some obscure and allusive matter in the words:

'She brought forth, as a man, of the Will.'

We have referred the last words, with some probability, to the Will of God, considering that the thought involved is parallel to that in the Western text of John i. 14; ('who was born . . . not of the will of man, but of God').

For the words, 'as a man', we must probably go to Dan. vii. 13, where 'one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven'; for this passage was very early interpreted of the Incarnation. Thus Justin, *Dial.* 76 says:

τὸ γὰρ ὡς υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου εἰπεῖν, φαινόμενον μὲν καὶ γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον μηνύει, οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπίνου σπέρματος ὑπάρχοντα δηλοῖ.

The language of Justin again recalls the terms of John i. 13.

The concluding sentences of the Ode are almost unintelligible, and without adequate motive. The conjecture in the *editio princeps* to read

'She loved him in his swaddling clothes'

was too violent a change to find acceptance; but there is something to be said for it. If we recall the natural hostility of the docetic mind to the Incarnation through a Virgin, and the objections of Marcionites and others to any natural birth at all as unworthy of the Son of God, we may, perhaps, be able to throw a ray of light on these concluding sentences. Thus Tertullian makes Marcion say:

'Indignum hoc Dei Filio.'

and he goes on to say:

'Dedigneris quod pannis dirigitur, quod unctionibus formatur, quod blanditiis desidetur.'—*De carne Christi*, c. 4.

Digitized by Google

Thus the last sentences of the Ode might be paraphrased:

> 'It was a great honour (not a dishonour) to have borne him:
> She loved him in his swaddling clothes,
> And watched over him with fondling,
> And exhibited him proudly.'

But this is not to be taken as criticism of the same order as the first part of this note. We concede the obscurity of the last clauses: but we have cleared up the difficulty of the Divine accoucheur. That is certainly from the 22nd Psalm.[1]

The statement that the Virgin brought forth her Son without assistance is an early article of the *Testimony Book*, where it is deduced from Daniel ii. 45, the stone in the vision of Nebuchadnezzar having been cut out *without hands* (which is a supplementary inference to the identification of Christ with the Stone of the Scriptures). The term 'without hands' (ἄνευ χειρῶν) appears to have been interpreted in two different ways, each of which was meant to emphasize the miracle of the birth: one way was to say that the Virgin had no consort, and so conceived without human co-operation; the other, that she had no woman's help at the time of the birth.

Thus in the Dialogue of *Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, c. 114, we have the matter introduced as follows:

> 'Zacchaeus said: From what mountain was the stone cut out? Athanasius: The mountain means the Virgin Mary. And that is why it says *without hands*, because she begat (γεννῆσαι) the Stone, i. e. the body (of Jesus), without human χειρουργία. For the prophet says: "Nebuchadnezzar dreamed a dream,"' &c.

Mr. Conybeare, writing in 1898, remarked on this passage[2] that 'one is tempted to render "without surgical aid of man"', but finally decides for the alternative meaning, 'without man's assistance' and refers to Justin, *Dial.* 76. The passage in *Athanasius and Zacchaeus* is based upon a primitive Testimony; and as soon as we have found the key-passage in Daniel, the whole matter becomes clearer, and we see the meaning of the language in the Ode and of the parallel passage in Justin.

When the Ode says of a Virgin that 'She brought forth a Son without

[1] We notice that Bernard had observed the underlying allusion to the Psalm.
[2] *Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, 112-14.

Digitized by Google

incurring pain, for it did not happen without purpose'; we may understand the words 'without purpose' (ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ = κενῶς?) to mean, 'not without prediction on the part of the prophets', or 'independently of God's expressed will'. When it says:

> 'She had not required a midwife,
> For He delivered her',

that is in its ultimate origin a comment on ἄνευ χειρῶν. When it says, 'She brought forth, as a man, of (her own) will', we should understand 'as a man' to mean the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel, who comes on the clouds, and is presented to the Ancient of Days: and in that case the 'Will' is not the Virgin's, but the 'Will of God'.

Now turn to Justin, *Dial.* 76, where we find that the 'Stone cut out without hands' means that He is *no work of man*, but *of the will* of the *God* of the Universe who sends Him forth. The whole passage is interesting:

> Ὅταν γὰρ ὡς υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου λέγῃ Δανιὴλ τὸν παραλαμβάνοντα τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν, οὐκ αὐτὸ τοῦτο αἰνίσσεται; τὸ γὰρ ὡς υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου εἰπεῖν, φαινόμενον μὲν καὶ γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον μηνύει, οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπίνου σπέρματος ὑπάρχοντα δηλοῖ. καὶ τὸ λίθον τοῦτον εἰπεῖν ἄνευ χειρῶν τμηθέντα, ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὸ αὐτὸ κέκραγε. τὸ γὰρ ἄνευ χειρῶν εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκτετμῆσθαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρώπινον ἔργον, ἀλλὰ τῆς βουλῆς τοῦ προβάλλοντος αὐτὸν πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων Θεοῦ.

Both the Odist and Justin are operating on primitive *Testimonies*, which will be found also in the collections of Cyprian, Gregory Nyss., &c. In the case of Gregory Nyss. (c. 8) the explanation given is the same as in Justin:

> 'The Stone which is cut out *without hand* (ἄνευ χειρός) is the one who was begotten without human seed'.

In Cyprian, *Test.* ii. 17, the hands are explained as 'Manus concidentium', i. e. hands of stone-cutters, and there appears to be no immediate reference to the Virgin.

The reference to the Virgin is not, however, excluded; for when Irenaeus discusses the *Testimonies* which identify Christ with the Stone, he makes the same expansion as Cyprian, and then goes on to explain the ἄνευ χειρῶν, not of the absence of a midwife, but of the non-cooperation of

Digitized by Google

Joseph. The passage is very interesting, for the context shows that Irenaeus also is working from the *Testimony Book*:

> 'Propter hoc autem et Daniel praevidens eius adventum, lapidem sine manibus abscissum advenisse in hunc mundum. Hoc est enim quod *sine manibus* significabat, quod non operantibus humanis manibus, hoc est *virorum illorum qui solent lapides caedere*,[1] in hunc mundum eius adventus erat, id est, non operante in eum Ioseph, sed sola Maria co-operante dispositioni. Hic enim lapis a terra et ex virtute et arte constat dei. Propter hoc autem et Esaias ait: sic dicit Dominus: Ecce ergo immitto in fundamenta Zion lapidem pretiosum, electum, summum angularem, honorificum: uti *non ex voluntate viri*, sed *ex voluntate Dei*, adventum eius qui secundum hominem est intelligamus.'—Iren. *Haer.* (iii, p. 217, Mass.).

The whole chapter is headed, *Quid est apud Danielem lapis sine manibus excisus?* There can be no doubt of the use of the Testimony Book in this section; the reason for turning to Daniel at this point is clear from the close of the previous chapter, in which it was stated that the Incarnation was not the will of man, but the will and work of God. Compare the following sentences with what has been just quoted:

> 'Sed quoniam inopinata salus hominibus inciperet fieri, *Deo adiuvante*, inopinatus et partus Virginis fiebat, Deo dante signum hoc, sed *non homine operante* illud.'

Here we take the words 'Deo adiuvante' to refer to the 'birth from the Virgin', the sense being the same as in the Ode:

> 'She did not need a midwife
> For He brought her to bear.'

It will not have escaped notice that all these references to a birth, not from man but from the will of God, are strongly supported by the Western text in John i. 13, where the will of man and the will of God are contrasted in the birth of Christ, 'who was born not of the will of man but (of the will) of God'. The thought of the 19th Ode and the ἄνευ χειρῶν of Daniel are behind the language of the Fourth Gospel.

The fantastic opening of this Ode will, perhaps, appear less fantastic and more in harmony with the rest of the collection if we keep two points before our minds: the first is the proved use of Sapiential matter by the

[1] Cf. Cyp. ut suprà: *Concidentium*.

Digitized by Google

Odist, for, as we have seen, Ode after Ode becomes intelligible as we examine the parallels in Proverbs and the other Sapiential books, as well as the proofs of the early Fathers that Jesus (*or* the Holy Spirit) was regarded as the Wisdom of God; the second point is the preference which the Odist shows for the symbol of 'milk' over that of 'wine', a preference so decided that it has sometimes led to the suspicion that the author was patronizing a milk-sacrament, like that of certain early heretics.

Let us then imagine that the Holy Spirit in this Ode is the Divine Wisdom, the Sophia of the Sapiential books. We shall hear her call clearly enough in the 33rd Ode, and find proofs there and elsewhere that the Odist is borrowing from the eighth and ninth chapters of Proverbs.

In this latter chapter, Wisdom sends out an invitation to a feast, and in particular to a cup which she has mingled,

> 'She hath mingled her wine.
>
> . . . .
>
> Come and drink of the wine which I have mingled.'

where the LXX has the curious expansion,

> 'She hath mingled her own wine into a cup,'
> *ἐκέρασεν εἰς κρατῆρα τὸν ἑαυτῆς οἶνον·*

and the 'cup' appears again in the following verse,

> 'She calls with lofty announcement *to the cup*, saying,' &c.
> *συγκαλοῦσα μετὰ ὑψηλοῦ κηρύγματος ἐπὶ κρατῆρα λέγουσα.*

What the Odist has done is to lay emphasis on this 'cup', and at the same time to explain that it is a 'cup of milk': hence he begins:

> 'A cup of milk was offered to me.'

Now he is in difficulties; for the Scripture calls it a 'mixed cup'; and how can a cup of milk be a mixed cup? The solution is that the milk has been taken from the two 'care-allaying breasts of the Father', as Clement of Alexandria would say.

If this is the right line on which we are to find the origin of the allegory of the cup of milk, we might be obliged to allow for this Ode a Greek origin, in view of the fact that it is the Septuagint that lays special emphasis on 'the cup'. We should also, in that case, hesitate to change the reading of the MS. from

> 'The Holy Spirit opened *her* bosom,'

Digitized by Google

for the LXX has an emphasis on the person of Wisdom who

'mingled into a cup *her own* wine',

where, if we read 'milk' for 'wine', we must also read 'her bosom' for 'his bosom'.

And why is the mixture given to the world without their knowing? We have the same difficulty in Ode xxx, again a Sapiential Ode, where the living water comes invisibly, and 'until it was set in the midst they did not know it'. The obvious parallel is John i. 10:

> 'He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not.'

That is not far from the expression that

> 'the Holy Spirit gave the mixed cup *to the world without their knowing*.'

There seems to be a missing link to connect all these passages together somewhere in the Old Testament. From the fact that the Fourth Gospel interjects the words 'and the world was made by him', which is the Sapiential definition of Christ, we should be disposed to look for the missing reference somewhere in the Sapiential books. We have not yet found it.

The emphasis on the *cup* which Wisdom mixes is due to the fact that the passage in Proverbs was a very early testimony, one of the proof-texts that Christ was the Wisdom of God. Thus in Cyp. *Test.* ii. 2 the passage is transcribed as in the LXX with

'miscuit *in cratere* . . . . .
convocans . . *ad craterem.*'

The heading of the section, which is evidently a translation from Greek, is:

> 'Quod Sapientia Dei Christus, et de sacramento concarnationis eius et passionis et *calicis* et altaris et apostolorum qui missi praedicaverunt:'

(*read* de calice et de altari et de apostolis: περὶ πάθους καὶ [περὶ] κρατῆρος κτέ.).

Thus the 'cup' is a part of the primitive proof that Christ is the Wisdom of God.

If we are right in our explanation that the Odist substituted 'milk' for 'wine' in the sentence

ἐκέρασεν εἰς κρατῆρα τὸν ἑαυτῆς οἶνον·

Digitized by Google

thus giving '*her own* milk' for '*her own* wine', we must recognize similar expressions in Ode viii:

> '*my own breasts* I prepared for them that they might drink *my own holy milk*.'

This would bring Ode viii also into still closer connexion with Prov. ix. 2, and, as before, it would be the text of the LXX that furnishes the explanation of the emphatic ἑαυτῆς or ἐμαυτοῦ, or the text of an early Testimony Book.

With regard to the painlessness of the Divine Birth, it may be of interest to observe that in one striking passage at least Ephrem contests the belief, e.g. *R. E.* iii. 6: 'The First Born entered the womb and the Pure One suffered not: He descended and came forth with pains; and the Fair One was agitated over Him.'

ODE XX

1 I am a priest of the Lord;
And to Him I do priestly service;

2 And to Him I offer the offering of His thought.

3 For His thought is not like (the thought of) the world,
Nor (like the thought of) the flesh;
Nor like them that serve carnally.

4 The offering of the Lord is righteousness;
And purity of heart and lips,

Cf. Ephr. *Epiph. Hymn.* iii. 12.

5 Offer your[1] reins (before Him) blamelessly;
And let not thy heart[2] do violence to heart;[2]
Nor thy soul do violence to soul.

6 Thou shalt not acquire a stranger . . .;
Neither shalt thou seek to deal guilefully with thy neighbour; (Cf. Exod. xxii. 24–26.)
Neither shalt thou deprive him of the covering of his nakedness. (Cf. Isa. lviii. 7.)

[1] B, my reins. [2] *lit.* pity.

Digitized by Google

7 But put on the grace of the Lord without stint;
And come into His Paradise[1] and make thee a garland from His tree; Cf. Gen. ii. 9 and Apoc. ii. 7.

8 And put it on thy head and be glad;
And recline on His rest;

9 And His glory shall go before thee; Cf. Isa. lviii. 8.
And thou shalt receive of His kindness and His grace[2]:
And thou shalt be fat in truth in the praise of His holiness.

(Doxology.)

10 Praise and honour to His name.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

vv. 1, 2. The Semitisms should be noted.

v. 6. This verse presents peculiar difficulties, and none of the proposals for its identification or interpretation appears to commend itself widely. We cannot, for instance, translate it as it stands:

'Thou shalt not acquire a stranger by the blood of thy soul.'

for this has no meaning: nor can we say that ܒܕܡܐ ܕܢܦܫܟ means 'in that he is what thou art'. We might possibly emend it to the form

ܠܐ ܬܣܢܐ ܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܒܕܘܡܝܐ ܕܢܦܫܟ

and translate:

'Thou shalt not hate the stranger who is in thy own likeness.'

The changes required are not violent; and the meaning might be that of Exod. xxiii. 9, 'Thou knowest the soul of a stranger, for thou wast a stranger.'

If we maintain the reading of the MS. the expression ܬܩܢܐ ܒ suggests acquisition for a price (ܕܡܝ̈ܐ), and the question then is as to the price to be paid for the stranger. The suggestion in the *editio princeps* to read

'Thou shalt not acquire a stranger by the price of thy silver,'

[1] the Paradise (H). [2] *Or*, goodness (B).

Digitized by Google

has been weakened by the discovery that the Nitrian MS. shows the very same text as Cod. H. This criticism applies, however, to most emendations that may be proposed. So we leave the matter with a margin of uncertainty. The verses which follow certainly find their parallel in the 22nd chapter of Exodus, where we meet with the prohibition of keeping a man's pledged garment after sundown.

Expository Notes.

This Ode has caused a good deal of difficulty both as to its text and as to its interpretation. In the fifth verse, both the extant MSS. read:

'Thou shalt not acquire a stranger by the blood of thy soul.'

The *editio princeps* suggested an emendation to this on the hypothesis that the word 'soul' had been accidentally repeated from the previous verse, and that we ought to read 'silver' instead of 'soul'; the sentence then runs with a microscopic change:

'Thou shalt not acquire a stranger by the price of thy silver.'

This would make excellent sense, and lead to the suggestion that the writer was an Essene, in harmony with the known prohibition of slave-holding amongst this austere sect.

The correction suggested was thought too violent by Flemming, who agreed, however, that 'by the blood of thy soul' should be corrected to 'by the price of thy soul', reading, that is, ܕܕܡ̈ܝܐ for ܕܕܡܐ.

To this Diettrich took further exception. There was, according to him, no need of change at all. It was merely a case of a wrongly divided word. The unintelligible ܒܕܡܐ was to be resolved into ܒ and ܕܡܐ, and translated: 'So that he is what thou thyself art,' or 'in that he is the same as thyself'; and Diettrich also endorsed the suggestion of an Essene prohibition of slavery. That was, we believe, the furthest point the discussion of the verse had reached textually, with any approach to probability.

Now let us see whether we can throw light upon this sentence in the Ode and upon the Ode generally from any other direction.

Recalling our observation of the way the Odist takes up a Scripture passage (say a Psalm), and works his own ideas into it and out of it, let us see if we can find his leading motive in the composition of the Ode.

Digitized by Google

Two directions suggest themselves to us; one was that of the first editor, who thought the Ode was inspired by the ethical prohibitions in Exod. xxii. 25, 26 against slavery, usury, and the retention of the pledged garment. The other we have marked on our margin that the inspiration comes from that very noble ethical outburst in the 58th chapter of Isaiah. The ninth verse of our Ode is, in fact, coloured by Isa. lviii. 8: we compare:

Ode xx. 9. '*His glory shall go before thee*
And thou shalt receive of His kindness and His grace.'

Isa. lviii. 8. '*Thy righteousness shall go before thee,*
The glory of the Lord shall be thy rearward.'

It is easy to see how the Odist has handled the text of the prophet.

The next question is whether he has made any further use of the text of his author, or if the reference is merely a casual reminiscence.

In the sixth verse the Odist says that one is not to deprive one's neighbour of the covering of his nakedness: this finds a good parallel in Isa. lviii. 7, as follows:

Ode xx. 6. 'Neither shalt thou deprive him of the covering of his nakedness.'

Isa. lviii. 7. 'When thou seest the naked that thou cover him.'

The previous sentence in the Ode says that we are not to *deal guilefully* with our neighbours. Now turn to Isa. lviii. 6, and we find the injunction to 'loose the bands of wickedness'; where the Peshitta version has

ܡܥܣܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܢܟܠܐ
bands of *guile*.

the same root that we have in the Ode. This passage, then, is the origin of the sentence we have in the Ode, and the suspicion arises that the Odist has been working from a Syriac text. We can go one step further, for we notice the same word ܢܟܠܐ in verse 9 of the Prophet, where it apparently answers to the Greek ἀδικία. It is the Peshitta version that invites the parallel. Now turn back again to the Peshitta text in verse 7. We find the injunction 'that thou hide not thyself from thy own flesh', in the form

ܘܠܐ ܬܒܣܐ ܡܢ ܒܪ ܒܣܪܟ .

i.e. 'and do not neglect the son of thy flesh.'

The expression 'son of thy own flesh' attracts our attention; if we write

Digitized by Google

'soul' for flesh, we have an expression which is very nearly the same in sense as the Odist's expression, 'He is what thy soul is'. So we suggest again that the Odist has been imitating the Syriac text of Isaiah; Isaiah has certainly been imitated elsewhere, which makes our conjecture probable. We can now remove the discontinuity in the writer's thought in passing from the sixth verse to the seventh. This discontinuity was recognized in the first edition in the words: 'then he leaves morals and is away in search of the honey-dew and the milk of Paradise. There glory waits the soul that enters into the Divine rest'. Even this discontinuity may have its motive; as we read on in the great chapter of Isaiah, we are told that 'the Lord shall guide thee continually and satisfy thy soul in dry places, and make strong thy bones; and thou shalt be like a watered garden'. For 'garden' the LXX reads κῆπος, but the Peshiṭta says *Paradise*, and gives the clue to the language of the Odist:

'Come into Paradise and make thee a garland from its tree.'

Now we see the reason for the discontinuity of the Ode; or rather, the apparent discontinuity has disappeared. The Odist concludes with the promise:

'Thou shalt be flourishing (*lit.* fat) in truth in the praise of His holiness.'

The word for 'fat' in the Ode (ܕܗܢ) is taken from the Peshiṭta rendering of Isaiah lviii. 11:

ܘܢܣܒܥ ܢܦܫܟ ܒܕܘܗܢܐ.

'and he shall satisfy thy soul with *fatness*.'

The case is not quite so conclusive as previous cases for the use of the Syriac, for the LXX has in the next sentence

καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ σου πιανθήσεται,

'thy bones shall be made fat.'

On the whole, the argument appears to be decisive in favour of a Syriac original for this Ode. The structure of the Ode appears also to be disclosed.

This particular section of Isaiah was much used by primitive Christians in arguing against the Jews and their ritual: Barnabas, for instance, uses it in c. 3, where he is arguing for a new fast, having previously argued for a new sacrifice and a new law. And it is clear that Barnabas is working from a collection of written *Testimonies against the Jews*. It is

Digitized by Google

quite likely, since the Odist begins the 20th Ode with a statement of the kind of sacrifice that pleases God, that he also has been using *Testimonia*: in other words, the passage of Isaiah on which he worked need not have come immediately from the Peshitta. The doctrine of the 'new priesthood' is also in the Ode.

For a Syriac parallel which seems to be based directly upon this Ode we may take Ephrem, *Hymni in S. Epiphan.* iii. 12:

> 'The anointed *priests* used to offer the slaughtered bodies of beasts: you, resplendent anointed ones, your bodies are your offerings; the anointed Levites offered *the reins* of beasts, you are more resplendent than the Levites, and you have *consecrated your hearts*.'

We note, in conclusion, that the opening verse of the Ode contains two strong Aramaisms:

'a priest . . . . I priest:'
'I sacrifice . . . . the sacrifice.'

Such forms of speech are possible in Greek; they are at home in Syriac.

In the foregoing study of the influence upon the Odist of a famous passage in Isaiah, we note that the very same coincidences (or nearly the same) had been detected by Connolly in an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July, 1913 (pp. 530–8). It is curious that the writer had used the coincidences to establish the exactly opposite conclusion to the one reached by ourselves, viz. that 'Greek is the original language of the Odes', a conclusion which was promptly challenged (though not very convincingly) by Dr. E. A. Abbott.

Connolly evades the force of the Odist's translation of 'garden' by 'Paradise' in harmony with the Peshitta rendering of Isaiah, and says 'that the Odist should put "Paradise" for "garden" is not surprising, for he devotes a whole Ode (xi) to Paradise'. We should have said that it was very striking that he should do so.

In dealing with the words 'thou shalt be fat', he takes the clause in the LXX for reference,

καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ σου πιανθήσεται,

when he should have taken the previous clause: but he omits to notice that the words used for 'fat' in the Odes is certainly the Peshitta word in the passage in question, when it might easily have been any one out of a group of three or four possible words: that is, he ignores linguistic

Digitized by Google

coincidence at the very point where coincidence counts. See also the further points to which we have referred. In passing from this point we may say that, while we quite agree with Connolly's criticism of Dr. Abbott's supposed Hebrew original for the Odes, we cannot agree with him that the Scriptural allusions of the Odes escape capture. He says (p. 535):

> 'It is unfortunate that—whether of set purpose or not we cannot say—the author has only too successfully disguised his Scriptural allusions. Sometimes the disguise is transparent enough, as when he says "as the eyes of a son to his father" (Ode xiv. 1): but though we can occasionally find the passage he is using, it is as a rule impossible to say whether he is working with any particular form of text.'

Exactly the opposite is the case, as we have shown by recovering a number of references to the Scripture (especially to the Psalms) and by indicating the particular version that is being followed.

The natural explanation of the Ode, as regards the priesthood which the author affirms in his opening sentence, is the spiritual explanation which is suggested in the first epistle of Peter, according to which the new race which follows Christ is also a new and royal priesthood. There is a residual possibility that the writer might have been a person of dignity in the church for which he composes his hymns, affirming his office towards God and against all other priesthoods, Jewish or pagan. As we have said, it may be doubted whether this is the simple and natural explanation; but in a theme so full of obscurities as the exegesis of the *Odes* one must fish all waters. It is something like the suggestion that the person who has the Lord on his head and has been thus crowned with a crown of truth, is the Apostle John, who, according to tradition, actually wore the high-priestly mitre and head-band with the Incommunicable Name. The question is raised whether such an explanation for St. John or some other one of the early Christian leaders, might not elucidate the interpretation of the Odes. For instance, the parallel with the passage in the Wisdom of Solomon, where Phinehas is said to bear the Divine magnificence 'upon the diadem of his head' (*Sap. Sol.* xviii. 24) would acquire fresh relevance. The reference for St. John similarly crowned is found in a fragment of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, who, writing in the time of the Antonines, says that John 'became (*or* was) a priest wearing the πέταλον, and a martyr and a teacher'. It is noteworthy that Polycrates does not call him a *high* priest, though Jerome, in translating the words of Polycrates, makes him

Digitized by Google

say so. But Jerome may very well be correct in saying 'Pontifex *eius*', so far as the added pronoun is concerned. According to Eusebius, upon whose extract of Polycrates Jerome is working, the language of Polycrates is

> ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναπεσών· ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορηκώς, καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος.

Is it possible that αὐτοῦ has dropped from the text of Eusebius after ἱερεύς? It would make an excellent parallel to the opening of this 20th Ode, where the Odist begins by saying 'I am a priest *of the Lord*'. But Jerome may have added the pronoun on his own account. In the Ode, the priesthood is expressly set in antithesis to the carnal priesthoods of the old law, and the affirmation that one was God's priest would be a negation of 'God's high priest' elsewhere.

The supposition that the early Christian teachers did actually wear visible emblems, comparable to those of the cult from which they had their origin, has been much discussed: see Routh, *Reliquiae*, ii. 27, for the evidence of Epiphanius that St. James also wore the πέταλον, and an anonymous statement to the same effect for St. Mark. It is within the bounds of credibility that some such custom prevailed. It would not follow, even if we accepted Polycrates and his Ephesian tradition, that St. John is himself the Odist, or the person of whom the Odist is thinking. Polycrates might have applied the language of the Odes about 'priesthood' and πέταλον to his great predecessor.

We are not, however, in a position yet to abandon the ordinary reference of the Odes to the Christian believers generally.

ODE XXI

1 My arms[1] I lifted up on high;
Even to the grace of the Lord:
2 Because He had cast off my bonds from me;
And my Helper had lifted me up to His grace and His salvation.
3 And I put off darkness,
And clothed myself with light: Cf. Ephr. *Epiph. Hymn.* vii. 22.

[1] B, arm.

Digitized by Google

4 And my soul acquired members
Free from sorrow,
Or affliction or pain.

5 And increasingly helpful to me was the thought of the Lord;
And His incorruptible fellowship.

6 And I was lifted up in the light,
And I passed before Him;

Sap. Sol. vi. 19; cf. Ode xxxvi. 6; and Koran iii. 40.

7 And I became near to Him,
Praising and confessing [1] Him.

8 He made my heart overflow; and it was found in my mouth;
And it shone upon my lips.

9 And upon my face the exultation of the Lord increased,
And His praise likewise.[2]
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 8. Three hypotheses are possible in the translation of the sentence ܐܪܒܝ ܠܒܝ. It may either mean '*my heart* ran over, *or* came forth', or 'I *will* make my heart run over, *or* come forth', or 'He made my heart run over *or* come forth'. Against the first translation we have the linguistic fact that when this verb is used in the form *Aphel*, it has always a transitive meaning and never an intransitive sense of 'he ran over, *or* came forth, gushed forth'. It is so used in Ode xxvi. 1. Against the second translation militates the fact that the sequence of the verbs would be impaired, for its rendering would then be, 'I *will* make my heart run over (*or* gush forth) and it *was* found in my mouth'. The future tense joined in the same phrase with the past tense is not very alluring linguistically. So far as the linguistic elements of the sentence are concerned, the only alternative left is to adopt the third

[1] *Or*, giving thanks to. [2] *Cod. B*: in His praise.

Digitized by Google

rendering 'He *made* my heart run over (*or* come forth) and it *was* found in my mouth and it shone upon my lips'. However unnatural the idea of God making a heart come to the mouth and shine upon the lips may seem to be, it is the genuine meaning of the Syriac text. If we were allowed to suppose that a word has disappeared from the text and that 'my heart' is the subject of the verb 'he made to run over' the object would be a dropped word ܡܡܠܠܐ or ܦܬܓܡܐ as in Psalm xlv. 1. In this hypothesis we should have the following sense, 'my heart *eructavit* (*sc.* a word), and it was found in my mouth and it shone upon my lips'.

Expository Notes.

In determining the meaning of this Ode our best plan will be to follow the method which has been so successful in previous Odes. Let us see if we can find the writer's literary model.

In the first place we notice a certain assonance running through the Ode. Compare:

v. 1. 'My arms I lifted up:'
v. 2. 'My helper had lifted me up.'
v. 6. 'I was lifted up in His light.'

The repetition at once betrays the origin of the Psalm; it can be detected even in the English version:

'I will *extol* thee, O Lord,
For thou hast *lifted me up*.'

Thus the 30th Psalm should be the key to the 21st Ode. Let us now see whether this assonance in the Ode is derived from the Hebrew, the Greek, the Targum, or the Syriac of the Psalm. In Hebrew the language is:

אֲרוֹמִמְךָ יהוה כִּי דִלִּיתָנִי

i. e. 'I will exalt thee, O Lord, for thou hast drawn me up (out of Sheol).'

In the LXX, too, the words are different:

ὑψώσω σε, Κύριε, ὅτι ὑπέλαβές με.

'I will exalt thee, O Lord, for thou camest to my help.'

The Targum also shows two different words.

Now turn to the Syriac, and we find:

ܐܪܘܡܡܟ ܡܪܝܐ ܕܐܪܝܡܬܢܝ

Digitized by Google

where we find the very assonance that the Odist has imitated. He was working, then, on the Syriac Psalter.

In verse 3 the Odist says that 'he has put off darkness and clothed himself with light'; this is a paraphrase for verse 11 of the Psalm:

'thou hast loosed my sackcloth and girded me with gladness';

the Odist turns the 'sackcloth' to mean 'darkness'; ('as black as sackcloth of hair'): and 'gladness' naturally to be the 'body of light'. 'My Helper' (ܡܥܕܪܢܝ) in verse 2 is related to 'more exceedingly helpful' in verse 5 (ܡܥܕܪܢܝܬܐ). The motive for it is in verse 10 of the Psalm:

'Hear, O Lord, have mercy upon me.
O Lord, be thou *my helper* (ܥܕܘܪܝ).'

'Praising and confessing Him' (*or* giving thanks to Him), might be thought a merely conventional expression in verse 7; but we notice that the Psalm in the concluding verse of the Syriac version has:

'For this I will sing (ܐܙܡܪ) *praise* (ܫܘܒܚܐ) to Thee and not be silent:
O Lord God forever will I confess (*or* give thanks ܐܘܕܐ) to thee.'

Thus the condition of dependence of the Ode on the Psalm can be seen in its texture throughout.

There are still some obscure turns in the Ode. What does it mean that 'I passed before Him and became near to Him'? We shall find something like this in the 36th Ode, where Christ is said to be one of the Divine neighbours; but the present Ode can hardly be *ex ore Christi*? If the Ode expressed a baptismal experience, as Dr. Bernard would urge, we could compare the language of Cyril of Jerusalem:

ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι λαμβανόμεθα ἔνδυμα ἀθάνατον· ἀνακαινιζόμεθα παντὸς παραπτώματος, καὶ ἐγγὺς τῷ Θεῷ γιγνόμεθα.—(*P. G.* 31, 1033).

Perhaps Cyril is quoting from the Ode before us. But perhaps also it is merely a reproduction of the language of *Sap. Sol.* 6. 19:

ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ Θεοῦ.
'Incorruption [*sc.* immortality] makes one near to God.'

The reference which precedes in the Ode to 'fellowship in *incorruption*' (verse 5) or 'fellowship *incorruptible*' should be noted. We must leave the matter for further investigation.

For an exact baptismal parallel we may take Ephrem, *Hymns for*

Digitized by Google

Epiphany, vii. 22, 'Cast off the darkness that is upon you. The secret darkness ye have cast off; from the water ye have clothed yourself with light.' But as we have shown, Ephrem uses our Odes, and deliberately re-baptizes them.

The expression 'my heart ran over and was found in my mouth' (verse 8) requires some explanation. It is evidently based on the opening words of the 45th Psalm, either in the Targum or in the related Peshiṭta Version.

The Targum has the same root which we have translated by 'ran over', and so has the Syriac; we may set the sentence of the Ode side by side with the other two as follows:

Ode xxi. 8: ܪܬܚ ܠܒܝ ܘܐܫܬܟܚ ܒܦܘܡܝ

Targum (Ps. xlv. 2): בעא לבי ממלל טב

Peshiṭta (Ps. xlv. 2): ܪܬܚ ܠܒܝ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܛܒܐ

There can be no doubt, then, that the Odist is imitating the 45th Psalm; what has 'run over' is the 'good word', and this is what was 'found in the mouth'. The opening of the 45th Psalm, as is well known, is one of the proof passages for the doctrine of the Logos, and as such acquired great currency. The Odist, working from a Syriac original, indulges his fondness for paronomasia by contrasting the verb which is used in the Psalm (ܪܬܚ = *eructavit*) with a similar verb (ܒܥܐ = *quaesivit*); the word-play cannot be reproduced in any other language. It is clear that the Odist was working from the Syriac or Aramaic Psalter.

Looking more closely at the texts we see that the Targum has done something of the same kind. Instead of a root נבע it has substituted בעא which appears to require translation,

'My heart *sought after* a good word.'

It is in this direction, then, that we are to find the clue to the meaning of the Odist's words:

'My heart (ran over with) *sc.* a good word:
(sought after)
And it (the good word) was found in my mouth.'

Now that we have once again found out the canonical Psalm on which the Odist is working, we are in a position which is favourable for further

Digitized by Google

investigation. For example, the 45th Psalm will find us the motive for the next clause:

'And it dawned upon my lips';

this comes from:

'grace is poured into thy lips.'

Nor is it to be neglected that this great Psalm, which the Christian tradition has, from the first, interpreted Messianically, is an epithalamium for King Solomon, and therefore peculiarly likely to be the subject of an Ode. When we come to the 26th Ode, the knowledge which we have acquired with regard to the composition of the 21st Ode in its closing verses, will help us to catch the motive of the opening verse in that Ode also. For we may regard the Syriac expression ܐܪܒ ܠܒܝ 'My heart poured out' ('eructavit cor meum') as a recognizable formula, just as we should recognize 'eructavit cor' if we came across it in Latin.

A conjecture may be offered as to the reason why the Targum substituted for ܐܪܒ the form ܢܒܥ with which our Odist seems to have been acquainted. May it not be that ܐܪܒ, in the sense of *eructavit* was vulgar and unsuited to public reading or recitation, and that for that reason a change was made to a closely related word? One often feels the vulgarity of the language in reading the 45th Psalm in Greek or Latin, or the 78th Psalm, with its similar opening

ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς·

when quoted by the Gospel of Matthew (Mat. xiii. 35). The Targum does not, however, avoid the word where it occurs in Ps. lxxviii, and is certified by the Hebrew. On the other hand in this Psalm the Peshiṭta avoids the strong expression and says 'I will speak parables'. Evidently there was some trouble over ܐܪܒ.

Not only is the Psalm to which we refer a Salomonic Psalm, and on that account one that the Odist might naturally study, but it is also the Psalm from which the Early Church, or the early Messianic preachers, took one of the titles of the Messiah, the title of 'the Beloved'. And whoever first employed this title, it certainly acquired Christian connotation; it is employed in the New Testament and it occurs in the Odes. The Psalm is headed in the Septuagint

ᾠδὴ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ,

Digitized by Google

a very striking headline, which brings 'Ode' and 'Solomon' very near together.

The Hebrew does not bring out 'the Beloved' quite as clearly; it says:

שיר ידידת

which we may render 'a song of loves' or 'epithalamium'; but a very slight change would restore 'Song of the Beloved' as in the LXX.

That the early Christians interpreted 'the Beloved' to be one of the titles of Jesus is certain. For example, Eusebius, *c. Marcellum*, says:

> 'This very one (*sc.* Christ) was the Beloved of God, as the title of the 44th (45th) Psalm discloses by its contents, viz.: An Ode for the Beloved.'

So also Euseb. *D. E.* iv. 15:

> 'Consider the matter more closely and see how according to the preface of the Psalm (Ps. xliv (xlv) *ut sup.*) he makes his discourse to open with the words *concerning the Beloved*.'

And in the same strain Eusebius speaks elsewhere.

Now this is not fourth-century theology; the Psalm in question is constantly appealed to by early Patristic writers. They could not have ignored its conventional heading.

ODE XXII

(Christ speaks.)

1 He who brings me down from on high;
And brings me up from the regions below;

2 And who gathers the things that are betwixt,
And throws them to me;

3 He who scattered my enemies
And my adversaries;

4 He who gave me authority over bonds,
That I might loose them;

Digitized by Google

5 He that overthrew by my hands the dragon with seven heads,
And set me at his roots[1] that I might destroy his seed—

6 Thou wast there and didst help me;
And in every place Thy name was round about me.

7 Thy right hand destroyed his wicked venom;
And thy hand levelled the way for those who believe in thee;

8 And it chose them from the graves,
And separated them from the dead.

Cf. Ezek. xxxvii. 4–6. 9 It took dead bones,
And covered them with bodies;

10 And they were motionless,
And it gave (them) energy[2] for life.

11 Thy way was without corruption and thy face;
Thou didst bring thy world to corruption;
That everything might be dissolved and renewed,

12 And that the foundation for everything might be thy rock;
Cf. Matt. xvi. 18. And on it thou didst build thy Kingdom;
Cf. Ps. xc. 1. And thou becamest[3] the dwelling-place of the saints.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 5. The MSS. have ܘܐܣܡܬܢܝ 'Thou hast set me at his roots', which is possible but not very grammatical. The copyists might have added the *taw* under the influence of the following verse. We have, therefore, suggested as a probable emendation ܘܐܣܡܢܝ. On the other hand, note that the Coptic text is against the emendation.

v. 10. We do not see why we should eliminate the *waw* before ܘܝܗܒܬ as Grimme has done.

[1] B, root. [2] H, Help [3] And it became.

Digitized by Google

v. 6. Schulthess suggests, as in the Coptic, the addition of ܥܡܝ 'with me'. The text, however, can do without the particle.

v. 7. B, has 'destroyed the poison of evil'.

vv. 8–10. Instead of the third person fem. sing., we can very well use the second person singular in verses 8–10; these two persons are distinguished one from another in the verbs employed in these verses only by a diversity of punctuation. The Coptic has used the second person.

Expository Notes.

We now come to one of the Odes which has become incorporated in the *Pistis Sophia.* Whatever hesitation we might have had as to the speaker in the previous Ode, we are confident that Christ Himself is the speaker in this Ode, and apparently Christ ascending from Hades. The opening sentence suggests Him that descended and ascended again; and the account of dead men taken from their graves and clothed again with flesh can hardly be anything else than the emancipation of the souls that are imprisoned in Hades. The Odist has no knowledge of a general resurrection (and in this respect, Bardaisan appears to have held the same view); but he has a belief in the immortality of the soul and the gift of God which is eternal life: and he has a strong doctrine of the Descent into Hades (see Ode xlii, for example).

It does not appear as if the Odist is deliberately working over a Psalm, as in previous cases. Where shall we find in a Psalm of the Old Testament a dragon with seven heads? We can, indeed, find a good reference in Psalm lxxiv. 13 'Thou brakest the heads of the dragons in the waters', a passage which with the addition of the seven heads, and the expansion of the waters by the addition of Jordan or some equivalent term, is commonly referred by the Patristic writers to the waters of baptism, and the enemy who is exorcised therein. But can we find an early instance of this exegesis? Here are some late examples that we have noted: the Greek ritual for the Blessing of the Waters at the Festival of the Epiphany says: 'Thou didst sanctify the streams of Jordan by sending from Heaven thy Holy Spirit, and by breaking the heads of the dragons lurking there'.

Digitized by Google

In a Homily ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus (tr. by Conybeare in *Expositor* for 1896, pp. 161 ff.) we find:

> 'Not any more let the race of men fear the craftiness and deceit of the serpent, because the Lord hath bruised the head of the dragon in the water of baptism.'

In the Armenian ritual for baptism (ed. Conybeare, p. 101) some manuscripts have:

> 'Thou, Lord, didst bruise the head of the dragon upon the waters. We humbly pray thee, look down upon this water, and send the gift of thy grace, and the benediction of the Jordan,' &c.

But here is something of an earlier date which bears upon the destruction of the poison of the serpent: Cyprian, in one of his epistles (Ep. 68, ed. Hartel, p. 764):

> 'diaboli nequitiam pertinacem ad aquam salutarem valere, in baptismo vero omne nequitiae suae virus amittere; quod exemplum cernimus in rege Pharaone.'

Here Pharaoh and the devil divide the honour of posing as the dragon: it is certainly curious that Cyprian's language 'nequitiae virus' should come so near to the 'wicked poison' of the Ode. The reference to Pharaoh is taken from Ezek. xxix. 3, 'Pharaoh, King of Egypt, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers'.

So much for the baptismal gnosis of the fathers and the rituals.

Turning to the Ode, we recognize in the story of the raising of the dead from Sheol the influence of Ezekiel, ch. xxxvii. Now we begin to strike linguistic parallels: the Ode says: verse 9 '(thy right hand) took dead bones and spread bodies upon them' (ܦܪܣܬ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ). The Peshiṭta says: 'and I will spread skin upon you' (ܘܐܦܪܘܣ ܥܠܝܟܘܢ). Here the Odist has used the same root as is employed in the Peshiṭta and the Hebrew (Gk. ἐκτενῶ) to express the spreading of skin over a body, and he has used it for the bringing of flesh upon bones. It was not the right word to use, but he took it from his context, i.e. from the Hebrew or the Syriac. We take it that he was using a Syriac text of Ezekiel. The next sentence, 'and thou gavest them energy for life', represents the Syriac 'and I will give you spirit and you shall live': but the sentence has a Greek look, for ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ stands for ἐνέργεια, and the word is actually preserved in the Coptic.

Digitized by Google

In verse 8 the sentence:

> 'Thou didst choose them from the graves,
> And separate them from the dead.'

is under the influence of verse 62:

> 'I will open your graves,
> And bring you up out of your graves';

but there is no preference for one version over the other.

The expression 'they were without motion' (ܘܠܐ ܡܬܬܙܝܥܝܢ) is obtained from the seventh verse of the prophecy, 'there was a moving' (ܙܘܥܐ). The Greek *σεισμός* would not furnish the required parallel. On the whole, we suspect Syriac origin for the Ode, but the case is not nearly so strong nor so convincing as some which we had from the Psalms.

If we are right in recognizing the influence of Ezekiel in the middle of the Ode, it would seem to be either on account of the liberation of souls from Hades or of the raising of the dead generally. The Syriac Bible heads the chapter 'Resurrection of the dead'. Ephrem used it to describe the escape from Hades. In the *Nisibene Hymns* (37, 5) he speaks as follows:

> 'I saw in the valley that Ezekiel who quickened the dead when he was questioned; and I saw the bones that were in heaps, and they moved; There was a tumult of bones in Sheol, bone seeking for his fellow, and joint for her mate; . . . Unquestioned, the voice of Jesus, the Master of all creatures, quickened them.'

The Ode itself suggests the release from Hades in the words:

> 'He gave me authority over bonds,
> That I might loose them.'

We have not, however, been able to find the thread of the sequence of the Ode, either for the opening verses or its close.

The perplexity concerning the Dragon and his roots and his seed (verse 5) may perhaps be illuminated by a reference to the Greek Acts of John (ch. 98) where the Gnostic writer of the Acts refers to *Σατανᾶς καὶ ἡ κατωτικὴ ῥίζα*, which root he identifies with the nature of created things. There is no need to accept his Gnostic interpretation of the 'root'; the point for us is the existence of an expression like the 'root of Satan'; for Satan as the dragon compare Apocalypse xii. 9:

> *ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς.*

Digitized by Google

Suppose we identify the Dragon with Satan and the Serpent in Genesis, as the Apocalypse suggests. We find that the Apocalypse also knows that the Dragon has seven heads. It is natural, then, to infer that we are dealing in some respects with an interpretation of the third chapter of Genesis (Gen. iii. 15). This, then, is the place where the reference to the 'seed' comes from, that is to be destroyed; for,

'I will put enmity between . . . *thy seed and her seed.*'

The woman and her seed are to be at war with the devil and his brood.

The word ܣܚܦ which is used of the 'overthrow' of the Dragon answers on the one hand to the repeated ἐβλήθη of the Apocalypse, and to συντρίψει of Romans xvi. 20; (Pesh. ܫܚܩ). As to the 'root', it is probably a Syriac or Aramaic variation of ܥܩܪ (root) for ܥܩܒ 'heel' of Genesis iii. 15.

If this is the right direction for the explanation of the Conflict with the Dragon in Ode xxii, we need not refer to the baptismal gnosis on the dragon in the midst of the waters, or the Patristic allusions to a dragon in the Jordan. There are no 'waters' in the curse on the serpent in Genesis. The allusions to the dragon in the baptismal rituals will belong to a later date, and to subsequent reflection.

The objection may be made that the dragon with seven heads ought not to be equated with the relatively terrorless snake in Genesis. The answer to this objection is (1) that the two are expressly identified in Apocalypse xii, (2) that the same variation between 'snake' and 'dragon' is found in Exodus iv, where it is noted by John Lightfoot as follows: 'Moses' rod at Sinai is said to be turned into "Naḥash", a common or ordinary snake or serpent; but when he casts it down before Pharaoh, it becometh "Tanin", a serpent of the greatest dimensions, belike a crocodile.' So, if more evidence is wanted than that of the Apocalypse, let Exodus be offered.

In the same connexion Lightfoot offered a weighty illustration of the truth that the bruising of the serpent's head belongs to the Messiah, for, as he says, 'It is worth the observing, that Moses is commanded to "take it by the tail", for to meddle with the serpent's head belonged not to Moses, but to Christ, that spake to him out of the bush"! No doubt Christ, as the seed of the Woman, is peculiarly set apart for the conflict with the head of the dragon. Does not the study of the Ode

Digitized by Google

show that Genesis iii was already interpreted Messianically in the days of the Odist?

To this there can hardly be any other than an affirmative answer, seeing that it is so interpreted in the Apocalypse. In the Odes, we have the seed of the Woman engaged in the destruction of the seed of the serpent; in the Apocalypse, we have the serpent plotting to destroy the residue of the seed of the Woman; the two interpretations are complementary. The seven heads of the dragon which are common to both of the interpretations belong to folklore rather than to Bible story: for this mythical creation ranges from Japan to the Scotch Highlands: its tale is told, as Professor Elliot Smith points out, in the 'Celtic Dragon Myth' of J. F. Campbell, as well as in the story of Herakles and the daughters of Hesperus: and it goes back to an original Octopus or devil-fish, which may well have been a terror to the inhabitants of the Levant or the Persian Gulf. That we have found the right meaning may be seen from Ephrem's *Hymns to the Virgin* (Lamy, ii. 606), where it is said that 'the boy trod on the cursed one and broke (the head of) the serpent, and cured Eve of the poison cast at her by the murderous dragon, who by his guile had overthrown her (ܦܣܩܬܗ) in Sheol'.

In reading this Ode we must pay careful attention to the periphrases which the Odist employs to describe the Divine Nature and the Divine Action. In the compass of this single Ode there is a rich harvest of Targumisms; we have the 'hand of God', the 'name of God', the 'right hand of God', the 'face of God'. The Odist will not even say that 'God is round about him'; he says that 'thy name was all round me everywhere'. He will not say that 'God is his rock'; he says 'Thy rock is the foundation of everything'. If we look at Psalm cxxv. 2, ('so the Lord is round about his people'), we shall find the origin of the Odist's language; the coincidence with the Syriac is very close:

ܘܡܪܝܐ ܚܕܪ ܠܥܡܗ
ܫܡܟ ܚܕܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ

The Targumic variation on the part of the Odist is very clear. It is not the official Targum that is here drawn on: that interpreter proceeds to get rid of the doubtful 'circumference' of God, by saying that 'the Majesty of the Lord is round about his people'. The same phenomenon appears in the closing verse of the Ode: the Odist will not say 'Lord,

Digitized by Google

thou hast been our dwelling place': he has, indeed, the expression ܒܝܬ ܡܥܡܪܐ as in the Peshiṭta, but it is equated not with God, but with the Kingdom that is founded. The official Targum alters the language of the Psalm in another direction: 'O Lord' he says, 'thy dwelling is the place of thy Shekinah in the heavens'. The Odist is clearly an independent Targumist in his manner of glossing the text, but as regards the text itself, he appears to depend on the Peshiṭta.

Here is another curious point with regard to the circumlocution noted above, according to which the Odist does not speak of God as his Rock in the same way as the Psalter so commonly does, and in spite of his proved dependence upon the Psalter. *The Peshiṭta version is in the same case:* it never translates 'God my rock', or the 'Rock of my salvation'. It always either omits or paraphrases the reference to God as Rock. The natural explanation is furnished us by the Targum, which does the same thing in its own way, commonly substituting 'fortitude' or some non-material expression. It seems, then, that the Odist and the Peshiṭta version are both under Targumist influence; the Odist was not independent of the Peshiṭta, and was working, for the most part at all events, on that text as his base. He was evidently speaking in the name of Christ.

ODE XXIII

1 Joy is of the saints!
And who shall put it on but they alone?

Cf. Sap. Sol. iii. 9; iv. 15.

2 Grace is of the elect!
And who shall receive it but they who trust in it from the beginning?

3 Love is of the elect!
And who shall put it on, but those who have possessed it from the beginning?

Digitized by Google

4 Walk ye in the knowledge of the Most High[1];
And ye shall know the grace of the Lord without grudging;
To His exultation and to the perfection of His knowledge.

5 And His thought was like a letter,
And His will descended from on high;

6 And it was sent like an arrow
Which is violently shot from the bow;

7 And many hands rushed to the letter,
To seize it and to take it and to read it.

8 And it escaped from their fingers,
And they were affrighted at it and at the seal that was on it.

9 For it was not permitted to them to loose the seal;
For the power that was over the seal was greater than they.

10 But those who saw it went after the letter,
That they might know where it would alight,
And who should read it,
And who should hear it.

11 But a wheel received it,
And (the letter) came over it;

12 And there was with it a sign
Of the kingdom and of the government.

13 And everything which was moving the wheel
It mowed and cut down;

[1] *Or*, of the Lord (B).

Digitized by Google

14 And it destroyed[1] many things that were adverse;
And it spanned[2] the rivers:

15 And crossed over and rooted up many forests,[3]
And made a broad path.

16 The head went down to the feet;
For down to the feet ran the wheel;
And that which had come upon it.

Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1.

17 The letter was one of recommendation[4];
For there were included in it[5] all districts:

18 And there was seen at its head, a head which was revealed
Even the Son of Truth from the Most High Father;

19 And he inherited and took possession of everything;
And the thought of the many was brought to naught,

20 And all the apostates[6] became bold and fled away,
And the persecutors became extinct and were blotted out.

21 And the letter became a great tablet,[7]
Which was wholly written by the finger of God;

22 And the name of the Father was upon it;
And of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,
To rule for ever and ever.

Hallelujah.

[1] Both MSS. it contained. [2] *Lit.* covered with earth. [3] *Or*, nations (B).
[4] *Or*, command; B, It was a letter and a command.
[5] *Lit.* were gathered together. [6] *Or*, seducers, leaders astray. [7] *Or*, volume.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 5. The idea that the 'will of God' descended from heaven is very common in Syrian Fathers and Syriac breviaries: 'His will descended and inhabited with its servants' (Ephr. iii. 248, *R. E.*); 'His will descended for men' (Ephr. *ibid.*, 249, &c.).

The expression that 'His Will descended from on High' is to be referred to the Incarnation, and the Lord is frequently referred to in the Nestorian rituals as the 'Invisible *or* Hidden Will'. Here are some extracts from Mar Abd 'Isho', which will illustrate the point.

> 'In a befitting way *His Will descended* towards men: He sent His Beloved, the Begotten of Himself, that is, His Express Image.'
>
> '*The Will of* the Creator *descended* and united itself to the will of the creature: the Divine nature clothed itself with the human nature.'
>
> 'The *Invisible Will came down*, took a *parsopa*, and appeared openly, and thereby renewed that which was broken up.'[1]

It is clear, then, that the Descent of the Will is another way of saying Incarnation. Probably the starting point for such a line of thought is Psalm xl. 5: 'Lo, I come: to do thy Will, O God.'

v. 13. The opinion of Bruston who suggests ܕܡܗܠܟܐ for ܕܡܗܠܟܗ is improbable.

v. 14. Both MSS. have ܕܦܘܣܩܢܝܐ; and the note to the text must therefore be changed accordingly. As far as the meaning is concerned, the word does not differ from ܕܦܘܣܩܢܐ, of which it is only the relative adjective.

v. 16. Gressmann's suggestion that the verb ܢܚܬ 'he came down' is the fem. sing. of ܢܚ 'he rested', is not good in the context.

In the next line we remark that H has the singular ܪܓܠܐ ('foot' *not* 'feet').

For the belief that the head which went down to the feet represents the descent of the Divinity upon the Humanity of Jesus, we may find some support in the following glosses:

> Melito, *Clavis*, 6. 1 'Caput Domini, ipsa Divinitas, eo quod principium et creator sit omnium rerum.'
>
> *In Daniele*, ii. 21 'Pedes Domini homo assumptus a verbo vel sancti apostoli.'

[1] The reference is to Badger, *Nestorians*, pp. 39, 41, 45.

Digitized by Google

In Deuteronomio: 'Qui appropinquant pedibus eius accipient de doctrina illius.'

Et in Psalmo. 'Adorabimus in loco ubi steterunt pedes eius.'

Eucherius, *Liber Formularum* (*P. L.* 50. 733 B): 'Sicut per caput divinitas, ita per pedes humanitas eius exprimitur: de qua humanitate in Exodo scriptum erat.' (Exod. xxiv. 10.)

v. 18. H has ܒܪܫܗ, 'his (*or* its) head' as referring to the other head mentioned in verse 16. According to this MS., therefore, it would seem that another head had sprung forth upon the first head. For the second ܪܫܐ Barnes suggests ܐܠܐ, which, however, would render the sentence ungrammatical.

v. 20. The verb ܐܡܪܚܘ 'they dared', 'they became bold' has been changed by Barth into ܐܬܡܚܪܘ 'they were hurt', 'wounded', 'maimed', or 'they perished', and by Wellhausen into ܐܬܦܪܚܘ 'sie wurden zerstreut'; which verb is commonly used in Syriac in the sense of 'to squander possessions', 'to dilapidate'.

Expository Notes.

This Ode is the most difficult of all the hymns in the collection. It contains an account of a mysterious letter, shot from heaven like an arrow from a bow, sealed with a terrible seal, written with the finger of God, and inscribed with the name of the Trinity. No one, so far, has succeeded in breaking this seal; it is too strong for the critics.

The opening sentences of the Ode in which the Odist prepares for his special message are quite intelligible. They take us to the Wisdom of Solomon: in the third chapter we read as follows:

οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτῷ συνήσουσιν ἀλήθειαν,
καὶ οἱ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσμενοῦσιν αὐτῷ,
ὅτι <u>χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ.</u>

Sap. Sol. iii. 9.

And again:

ὅτι <u>χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ.</u>

Sap. Sol. iv 15.

Digitized by Google

This is the passage which has suggested to the Odist the refrain:

> 'Joy is of the saints:
> Grace is of the elect:
> Love is of the elect.'

and he goes on in the language of Wisdom

> 'Walk in the Knowledge of the Most High
> . . . . . . to the perfection of Knowledge.'

So far we might classify the Ode as one of the Wisdom Odes, and as half-Gnostic. Now comes the mystery, for the preface is ended. Various explanations have been offered of the letter, and the wheel that comes over it, or on to which it comes. Some have compared the flying roll in Zechariah, some the mysterious letter in the Hymn of the Soul, or the letter carried by an eagle in the Baruch story: but the obscurity is undispelled, and we can only give the best translation that seems possible and offer a tentative elucidation.

There is an explanation suggested by the Syrian Fathers, and especially by St. Ephrem, that the mysterious letter is the message which Gabriel brought to the Virgin. As we have shown abundantly the acquaintance of Ephrem with the Odes, which he quotes and misquotes, understands and obscures, it will be proper to examine what he has to say on the subject of a letter from Heaven. In the *Hymns on the Virgin*, Ephrem says expressly that Gabriel brought with him a letter:

> 'He brought *a letter which was sealed* with the mystery hidden from the ages; and its contents were peace to the maiden and good hope to all the ages.'

ܥܡܗ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܚܬܝܡܐ
ܒܐܪܙܐ ܕܟܣܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܡ̈ܐ
ܘܡܠܝܗ̇ ܫܠܡܐ ܠܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܘܣܒܪܐ ܛܒܐ ܠܟܠܗ ܥܠܡ̈ܐ.

(Ed. Lamy, ii. 593.[1])

[1] See also col. 641 of the same volume:

> 'The Father had written a letter: by the hand of the Watcher (*sc.* Angel) He sent it to Nazareth: to the Virgin Mary whom He had chosen and had good pleasure in, that she should be the Mother of the Only-Begotten.'

For further references see Narsai quoted in *Brev. Chald.* i. 46; Jacob of Sarugh, *Liber perfectionis* (ed. Bedjan), p. 727, &c.

Digitized by Google

We get the same thought in the Oriental Breviary as follows:

'[God] sent a letter which He sealed with His essence, which has no beginning.'[1]

'[Gabriel] entrusted to her [Mary] the letter which had been entrusted to him by the Father.'[2]

'Gabriel was sent by the Father to Mary, he took a letter and descended. This letter contained a mystery hidden from the Ages.'[3]

The Letter appears, then, to be something of a documentary character; for the Odist reminds us in concluding his story that it was written by the finger of God, like the Ten Commandments. Where shall we find a missing document that answers to the conditions? And what is the meaning of all the strife that is provoked by the Letter and its attendant Wheel? The only clue that seems worth following, as we have just seen, is the Syriac reference to the Salutation of the Virgin by the angel Gabriel, as being in the form of a letter. In that case, the Ode is a dramatic representation of the Incarnation. Let us see if there is any light thrown upon the Ode in this direction.

According to the Odist, the Letter was a great volume or tablet; 'tablet' is the best explanation for the Syriac word that is employed, in view of the parallel with the tables inscribed by the finger of God. When we write down the word 'a great tablet' we are confronted with Isaiah viii. 1, the prologue to the story of the Birth of the Messiah:

'Take thee a great tablet.'

No doubt, then, we are on the right track. The Hebrew and Peshiṭta texts use a different word, the former of necessity (for ܦܢܩܝܬܐ is of Greek origin), the latter because it imitates the Hebrew: the Targum has also a different word, which also means 'tablet'. The LXX prefers 'a roll of paper'. The language of the Odist appears to be independent of these possible sources, but his meaning is the same.

Isaiah continues with an injunction of the Lord to write on the tablet 'with the pen of a man'. This is the starting-point for the next statement of the Odist, that the Letter was altogether written by the finger of God.

[1] Ed. Bedjan, i. 44. [2] Ibid., p. 45. [3] Ibid., p. 77.

Digitized by Google

He often works with antitheses of this kind, and appears to have thought that a human pen was not adequate to the mystery that he was unfolding. So far, we appear to be on the right track; it is the coming of Christ that is being described, and the Scripture is drawn upon that describes that coming.

Now we begin to see daylight in some other directions. The Will of God that descends from Heaven answers to another Scripture:

'Lo! I come,
In the volume of the book it is written of me . . .
To do thy will, O God.'—Ps. xl. 7, 8.

It may, then, be very properly said that 'His will descended from on High'.

Then, in the next place, it is probably from the fifth verse of the same Psalm:

'Thy thoughts which are to us-ward;'

that this Odist derives his expression:

'His thought was like a letter;'

the same word, ܡܚܫܒܬܐ, being used here by the Odist and the Peshiṭta version.

The third verse of the Psalm has also been drawn upon somewhat perversely, for the sentence really belongs to the previous verses:

'Many shall see it and shall fear.'

Accordingly the Odist has a rush of hands to seize the sealed letter, which escapes them, and they are frightened at the Letter and the terrible seal that was on it. (The Peshiṭta says, 'they shall see it and *rejoice*'.) The reason for the introduction of the seal takes us back to Isaiah viii. 16:

'Bind up the testimony,
Seal the law among my disciples.'

The Odist goes on to explain that the reason why the many who saw the letter went after it was in order that they might know where it would alight and who should read it. Here we have probably an echo of a controversy as to the place where the Messiah was to be born.

Digitized by Google

We know the evangelical solution of the problem: but the Odist has his eye on the time when the problem was still unsolved.[1]

The references to the Kingdom and the Government are easily made from the tablet of Isaiah, e.g.

> Isa. ix. 7. 'The increase of His government, . . . the throne of David . . . and His Kingdom.'

So also the references to the Trinity, and to 'rule that is for ever and ever', are all deducible from the same section, for 'of the increase of His government there shall be no end . . . from henceforth even for ever'. No reference to the New Testament is necessary.[2]

There remains the mysterious 'wheel' and the conflicts that are associated with it. All the rest of the Ode appears to be cleared up. How does the Wheel and its warfare come into the story of the Nativity? And who are the persecutors and the apostates?

Is it possible that Wheel stands for Angelic Being? There is some ground for this in Syriac. See the Thesaurus under ܓܠܓܠܐ. Examples might be multiplied.

The expression 'there was seen at its head the head which was revealed', is an attempt to avoid saying something of an anthropomorphic character. Whenever we come across the expression ܐܬܓܠܝ with or without ܩܕܡ, we may expect to find traces of Targumism; for this is the way in which one avoids saying that God knows or that God sees. Say rather, it is revealed before Him, or it is seen before Him. The language of the Ode is then a periphrasis: it probably means that 'God was seen at the head of the letter, and the Son of Truth from the Father', but this is what the Odist does not like to say even parabolically; so he produces a sentence in the style of the Targums.

[1] Or it may be that there is a reference to the Cave of the Nativity, which was thought to be foretold in Isa. xxxiii. 16. 'His lodgement ܡܫܪܝܗ shall be in a lofty cavern'; cf. Justin, *Dial.* 78, and Luke ii. 7 (*καταλῦσαι*, *καταλύματι*).

[2] The Testimony writers prove the endless reign of Christ from the texts which establish the first Advent: e.g. Cyprian, ii. 29 'Quod ipse sit *rex in aeternum regnaturus*'. Proofs follow from Zach. ix. 9; Isa. xxxiii. 14 sq. (the 'cave'-passage, &c.).

Digitized by Google

ODE XXIV

1 The Dove flew over the head of our Lord the Messiah,[1]
Because He was her head;

Cf. Ephr. *Hymn. in Fest. Epiph.* i. 89.

2 And she sang over Him,
And her voice was heard:

3 And the inhabitants were afraid,
And the sojourners trembled;

4 The birds took to flight,
And all creeping things died in their holes.

5 And the abysses were opened and closed;
And they were seeking for the Lord, like (women) in travail:

6 And He was not given to them for food
Because He did not belong to them:

7 And the abysses were submerged in the submersion of the Lord:
And they perished in the thought which they had existed in from the beginning.

8 For they travailed from the beginning,
And the end of their travail was life.

9 And every one of them that was defective perished;
For it was not permitted to them to make a defence for themselves that they might remain:

10 And the Lord destroyed the imaginations
Of all them that had not the truth with them;

[1] H, over the Messiah.

Digitized by Google

11 For they were defective in wisdom,
They who were lifted up in their hearts.

12 And they were rejected,
Because the truth was not with them.

13 For the Lord disclosed His way,
And spread abroad His grace;

14 And those who understood it
Know His holiness.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 3. This verse appears to have been derived from the song of Moses at the Red Sea, e.g. Exodus xv. 29 (Syr.):

> 'The peoples heard it and trembled. Then the chieftains of Edom (ܐܕܘܡ) were afraid; and the strong men of Moab, shaking took hold of them; and the dwellers (ܥܡܘܪ̈ܐ) of Canaan were all defeated.'

If this is a correct identification of the language, the Ode is in part an Ode of deliverance at the Red Sea; and the abysses in verses 5, 7 which are submerged, are to be sought for in the same song. Cf. verse 8:

> 'the abysses sunk down in the heart of the sea.'[1]

v. 4. The expression ܫܒܩܬ ܓܦ̈ܝܗ means literally 'left its wings', and therefore can hardly be translated linguistically by 'dropped its wings'. The verb is used in Ode xxxiii. 3, and frequently by other writers, in the sense of 'to give freedom to an object in order to accomplish the function assigned to it with all its energy'. It is so used in the vulgar

[1] So we translate ܛܒܥ according to the Syriac lexicographers, who explain it by رسب (*fundum petivit*), and this translation is in good agreement with ܐܬܛܒܥܘ of the Ode.

Digitized by Google

Syriac of our days. Following this sense the meaning of the sentence would be, 'Fowl flew swiftly'. This meaning is rendered necessary by B, which instead of ܦܪܚܬܐ has ܦܪܚܬ 'it (the dove) flew'. We could with difficulty evade this sense with the last reading, which seems preferable, corresponding as it does with ܦܪܚܬ of the first verse.

The opinion of Bruston, who regards the verb ܚܒܠܗ as a 'substantive': 'Un mal mortel le retenait', is very improbable.

v. 5. We think that the verb ܘܐܬܛܡܫܘ 'and they were closed', 'and they hid themselves', or 'they were hidden, covered' is good in the sentence, and we do not see why we should change it to ܘܐܬܒܩܝܘ 'and they looked', as Labourt has done.

Gressmann has suggested that instead of ܒܥܘ ܠܡܪܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘܝܢ ܕܡܬܠܕܢ we might read ܒܠܥܘ ܠܡܪܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘܝܢ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ 'and they swallowed the Lord like things belonging to them'. Such violent and unnecessary changes cannot commend themselves. The same may be said in the first line for Grimme's emendation of the existing phrase into ܘܕܐܬܛܡܫܘ ܗܘܘ and Frankenberg's reading ܘܐܬܛܡܫܘ ܕܗܘܘ. There is also no necessity to change ܒܥܝܢ into ܡܥܝܢ as Grimme has done in the second line.

v. 6. Cod. H omits ܠ before ܠܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ, which gives the sense, 'and no food was given to them'.

v. 7. This is the only meaning the Syriac sentence can have.

It is clear that the Odist wishes to say that when Christ was baptized something depressing happened in the lower world. The passage and its correct meaning was known to Ephrem Syrus, who in his *Carmina Nisibena* (35, p. 59) makes the devil say that 'when Christ was submerged in baptism, He broke away and swamped me'.

The Odist has the same thought in his mind in Ode xxxi, 2:

> '*The abysses* were dissolved before the Lord:
>
> . . . .
>
> Folly was *submerged* by the truth of the Lord.'

v. 9. Bruston erroneously reads ܕܦܣ̈ for ܕܦܣ or ܦܣ and believes that the word stands for ܕܦܐ 'tablet'.

v. 12. The suggestion of Grimme, who regards all the second member of this verse as dittographical error, is not necessary.

Digitized by Google

Expository Notes.

Another Ode thick with obscurity. Its opening describes the descent of the Spirit upon Christ at His baptism, and describes it in unorthodox language, by making the Spirit subordinate to the Son. We have shown how Ephrem corrects the Odist for his lapse from correct theology. It was suggested in the first edition that there was uncanonical matter involved in the account of the fluttering and singing dove. However that may be, the baptismal incident is soon ended, and we are apparently plunged into Hades along with Christ whom the abysses are expecting to devour. As Cyril of Jerusalem says:

> 'His body was made to bait death withal, to the end that the dragon, lying in wait to devour Him, might cast forth those whom he had already devoured.'—*Catech.*, xii. 15.

This quaint belief, that Hades desired to devour and was compelled to disgorge, appears to have been a favourite conceit of the ancients. We shall find it again in Ode xlii. 11: 'Death cast me up and many along with me'; and it is dilated on at length by Ephrem in his *Carmina Nisibena*, e. g.

> 'I, Sheol, was fed upon the dead; yea, I feasted upon corpses: Elijah slew the prophets of Baal and gave them to me'; 'The righteous constrained me to devour, but Jesus has compelled me to disgorge.'

There seems to be some occult connexion of ideas between the baptism of Christ and the descent into Hades; what else does it mean when it says 'the abysses were submerged in the submersion of the Lord'?

Almost every sentence in this Ode is obscure, and we have failed to get completely into the Odist's world of ideas. Kleinert and Harris have suggested that there is some allusion to the Flood, especially in verse 4; but the arguments are not satisfactory nor conclusive.

v. 6. 'He was not given to them for food, because He did not belong to them.'

The meaning is brought out more clearly by a comment of Victorinus on Apocalypse xii. 4, where the seven-headed dragon tries to devour the

Digitized by Google

seed of the woman. Victorinus (is he here quoting Papias, as in so many other cases?) says that:

> 'He who was not born of seed, owed nothing to death, therefore He could not devour Him, that is, detain Him in death,—for on the third day He rose again.'

As this reference of Victorinus, with its possible dependence on Papias, and its certain allusion to the dragon that would devour the seed of the woman in the Apocalypse (xii. 4), is of critical importance, we transcribe the Latin of Victorinus:

> 'Sed qui de semine natus non erat, nihil morti debebat, propter quod devorare eum non potuit, id est in morte detinere, nam tertia die resurrexit.' (*P. L.* v. 336, D.)

If this is based on Papias, it throws the Odist into the same current of beliefs with the millenarians who first expounded the Apocalypse. We have, however, found nothing eschatological or millenarian in the Odes. This suggests that the Odist is not a commentator on the Apocalypse, but that he shares certain Messianic ideas with the author of that book, as, for example, the fight between the dragon and the woman, and between his seed and her seed.

Is it possible that Victorinus (or Papias) may have drawn on the Odes?

Certainly there is another Ode whose meaning is much clearer after reading Victorinus. In the 31st Ode (v. 8) Christ is made to say:

> 'They made me a debtor,
> (though I rose up):
> Me, who had not been a debtor.'

If we take this to mean that Christ was made to pay the debt to death, which he could not really pay, and that He rose from the dead, we have the very meaning in the passage from Victorinus.

We see a further link between the Odist and the author of the Apocalypse: for Victorinus says that the dragon could not devour the Messiah, i. e. he could not hold Him in death. Thus the *devouring* of the man-child in the Apocalypse means the death of Christ, and the Odist says the same thing. He also believes that Death could not devour Him; He was no food for that abyss.

Digitized by Google

ODE XXV

1 I was rescued from my bonds;
And unto thee, my God, I fled.

2 For thou wast the right hand of my salvation,
And my helper.

3 Thou hast restrained them that rise up against me,
And they were seen no more:

4 Because thy face was with me,
Which saved me by thy grace.

5 But I was despised and rejected in the eyes of many:
And I was in their eyes like lead;

Cf. Sap. Sol. iii. 16, and cf. Ode xxviii. 9.

6 And I acquired strength from thyself,
And help.

7 Thou didst set me a lamp at my right hand and at my left,
That in me there may be nothing that is not bright;

8 And I was covered with the covering of thy spirit;
And I removed from me the raiment of skins.

9 For thy right hand lifted me up,
And removed sickness from me.

10 And I became mighty in thy truth,
And holy by thy righteousness;

11 And all my adversaries were afraid of me:
And I became the Lord's by the name of the Lord:

12 And I was justified by His gentleness,
And His rest is for ever and ever.
Hallelujah.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 2. The opinion of Labourt, who thinks that instead of ܕܦܘܪܩܢܐ we should read ܘܐܬܐ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ, is unnecessary.

v. 5. ܐܝܟ ܐܒܪܐ 'like lead' is not a very happy image. Would it not be possible to suppose that it was the Biblical word ܐܝܟ ܐܒܝܕܐ 'like a lost, damned (man)' as in Ode xxviii. 9? Or does the Odist mean that Christ's enemies thought he had sunk like lead into the great abyss? Cf. Exodus xv. 10 'they sank like lead in the mighty waters'.

v. 8. The verb ܘܐܫܠܚܬ may very well be understood in the second person, 'Thou hast taken off'; the Coptic has the first person. So is the case with ܘܐܠܒܫܬ of the next verse, which may be taken as the third person feminine referring to 'thy right hand', or as the second person singular referring to God.

v. 10. Frankenberg proposes to read ܘܚܣܝܢܐ 'and strong' for ܘܚܣܝܐ, which is possible.

v. 11. The second line is wanting in the Coptic.

Expository Notes.

This Ode is of a much more intelligible structure than those which immediately precede. It appears to be a song of personal redemption and illumination. One or two verses have an appearance of being *ex ore Christi*. For example, in verse 5 one recognizes the refrain of 'despised and rejected'; and if we may make a slight correction in the Syriac and read ܐܒܝܕܐ instead of ܐܒܪܐ, we should have a parallel to 'I was in their eyes like a lost man', in the 28th Ode (verse 9), where Christ says

'I seemed to them as one of the lost.'

The objection would be that the Coptic, as well as the Syriac, has 'lead'. But this objection is not final, as the texts in question are closely related. Moreover, we get the same refrain again in the 42nd Ode (verse 10), where Christ is certainly the speaker:

'I was not rejected, though I was reckoned to be so:
I did not perish, though they thought it of me.'

Evidently these Odes are by the same author, and they must be early, for they convey an impression of surprise at the recovery and resurrection of

Digitized by Google

Jesus, which would not have been natural in times very long after the foundation of the Christian Church. It is not, however, easy to see how to refer this Ode generally to the mouth of Christ.

For the enemies who have been turned back, and who are seen no more, we have also parallels in the rest of the Odes. For instance, in Ode xlii. 5:

'all my persecutors are dead.'

Again in Ode xxiii. 20:

'The persecutors became extinct and were blotted out.'

Again in Ode xxii. 3:

'He scattered my enemies and my adversaries,'

followed as in Ode xlii by a descent into Hades.

If these sentences refer to Christ and his enemies and persecutors we may, perhaps, regard them as written during an interim peace of the early Church; but we are still in difficulty as to the division of the 25th Ode between the prophet and Christ.

In another direction, we are encompassed with interpreters' difficulties. The Ode appears to come from a Semitic hand; the writer is 'covered with the covering of thy Spirit'; and there is a Semitic play on words in verses 8, 9:

'I *removed* (ܐܪܚܩܬ) from me the raiment of skins:
Thy right hand *lifted me up* (ܐܪܚܩܬܢܝ).'

But, on the other hand, as we have shown in the Introduction, the writer concludes with a statement that he is a Christian justified by the kindness (χρηστότης) of God. This seems to require a Greek authorship.

The closing verse of the Ode has, in fact, been interpreted in the Introduction as covering a Greek play on the words χριστός and χρηστός, which is taken up in the reference to justification by the gentleness (χρηστότης) of the Lord. The argument is a very strong one, and thoroughly harmonious with an Antiochian origin for the Odes.

But there stands against it the strikingly Semitic language of the previous verses, such as

'*covered* with the *covering* of thy Spirit,'

Digitized by Google

and especially the play on words involved in

'Thou didst *remove* (ܐܪܝܡܬ) from me.'
'Thy right hand *lifted me up* (ܐܪܝܡܬܢܝ).'

It is not easy to reconcile the two points of view. If the Syriacisms are not to be got rid of, we must find some other method of dealing with the closing verse, or say that the writer was bilingual and thought in two languages. Perhaps there may be in the closing sentences a reference to Isaiah xliv. 5:

'One shall say, *I am the Lord's*,
And another shall call himself *by the name* of Jacob,' &c.

This would make a very good starting-point for the verse:

'I became the Lord's
By the Name of the Lord.'

v. 7. The key to this passage was suggested in the *editio princeps*, which adds a foot-note referring to Psalm cxxxii. 17. Apparently it was regarded as a case of the use of biblical language by an author who was familiar with the Psalms.

Now that we know more about the Odist's methods, we inquire whether he has the actual Psalm before him, and is making use of it.

The Odist goes on from the mention of the lamps to the right and to the left and discourses about the covering or enduement of the Spirit which he has received; when we turn to the Psalm we find two references to clothing adjacent to the verse which we are discussing: the previous verse says:

'I will clothe her priests with salvation;'

the following verse says:

'His enemies will I clothe with shame.'

Thus the Psalm furnished the suggestion for the 'covering' in the Ode.

In the ninth verse of the same Psalm we find again an allusion to the clothing of God's priests with righteousness. Suppose we now look for closer coincidences in language or ideas. Our guides are the Peshitta version and the related Targum.

The first thing we notice is that the Targum regards the Psalm as

Digitized by Google

a prayer made by David over *Solomon* as the anointed or Messiah: thus in verse 10:

'Turn not away the face *of Solomon thy Anointed*.'

The Peshiṭta has a trace of the same identification, for it ends the seventeenth verse of the Psalm with

'I will make bright a lamp for his (*sc.* David's) anointed.'

This is very remarkable; it seems that Solomon has been interpreted as the Messiah of the Psalm, and equated with the Christ of the New Testament. Then we notice that the allusion to the Odist's adversaries,

'All my adversaries were afraid of me,'

is derived from the closing verse of the Psalm,

'His enemies will I clothe with shame.'

So much for the transference of ideas: we now look for linguistic imitations and parallelisms. The Odist speaks of being *covered with the covering* of the Spirit: three times over the Targumist changes the word 'clothe' of the Hebrew into *clothe with the clothings*, verses 9, 17, 18: and note that the Odist has the same duplication and has also imitated the plural לבושין in the 'clothings of skin' ܠܒܘ̈ܫܝ ܡܫܟܐ which follow.

About the 'coats of skin' we may compare the Manichaean tenets as exposed by Ephrem (Mitchell, p. xxx). According to them the 'sons of Darkness' had skins; the father 'Darkness' became intoxicated and perverted the pure souls (cf. Odes xxxviii. 9–15 and xxxiii. 5–13, and xxi. 3). The work of God consisted in taking off the garments of 'skin-darkness' and replacing them with 'soul-light'. From p. lxviii (ibid.) we learn that the Manichaeans and Bardesanites believed that 'This body with which we are clothed is of the same nature as the Darkness, and this soul which is in us is of the same nature as the Light'.

The Odist has the lamp of the Anointed *set*; but uses a different word from the Hebrew or Targum: the word which occurs in the Peshiṭta (ܐܢܗܪ = I will make to shine, I will kindle), is responsible for the clause:

'That in me there may be nothing that is not shining.'
(ܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܪܐ)

For the *lamp* that shines, both the Targum and the Peshiṭta coincide in the form ܫܪܓܐ with the Odist. It seems, then, that there is some interdependence between the Odist and the Targum and the Peshiṭta

Digitized by Google

Version. We need not be surprised at the prominence which this Psalm acquires in the Christian tradition. As a matter of fact, it is one of the first Messianic Psalms in the New Testament usage, and is quoted by St. Peter in the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles: it contained the promise to David that from his seed one should sit on his throne. This Salomonic prediction is repeated by the earliest Christian fathers, and is a part of the public preaching of the Church. It is easy to see how Odes which affect to relate to Solomon, but which really refer to Christ, should have incorporated matter from the Psalm in question.

If we are correct in this interpretation, we may have to abandon the idea of a Greek play upon the name of Christ in the closing verse of the Ode. We will not do so too hastily, for there is some suspicion that the Odist, though writing in Aramaic, was also acquainted with Greek, and if so, the popular play upon χριστός and χρηστός may very well have occurred to him in discussing a Psalm whose theme was recognized to be the Messiah of the house of David.

It may be asked why the Odist in borrowing the lamp of the anointed has duplicated it, 'a lamp at my right hand, and a lamp at my left'. Possibly he remembered that the Law was spoken of as a lamp, e.g. Proverbs vi. 23:

> 'The commandment is a lamp and the law a light;'

and it may have occurred to him that there were two laws, the Old and the New, the Law and the Gospel. Thus he makes a duplication something like that in the nineteenth Ode, where milk is taken from the *two* breasts of the Father. This is a speculation, it is true, but not altogether a wild surmise. In any case, we appear to have found the Biblical origin of the lamp in the twenty-fifth Ode; and we may be satisfied that it has nothing to do with the late baptismal ritual, which Dr. Bernard assigns as its origin.

That the lamp at the right hand is the Law may be seen from the Targum on Psalm xlv. 10; for

> 'At thy right hand stands the queen in gold of Ophir,'

we have

> 'The book of the law is ready at thy right hand and is written in the gold of Ophir.'

There seems to be a survival of this belief that the law stands at the right hand and the gospel at the left, in the custom which prevails in the

Digitized by Google

Roman Catholic Mass of placing the book of the Gospels successively at the right and left hand of the officiating priest. It may also be said that the language is mystical, and is parallel to a prayer for illumination in Abū Ṭālib. I. 6.[1]

'O God, give me light in my heart, . . . light in my flesh, light in my bones, light before me and light behind me, *light at my right hand, light at my left hand*, light above me, light beneath me. O God, augment my light and give me light and procure me light.'

It is permissible to punctuate the text so as to read 'I set to myself a lamp'.

ODE XXVI

Ps. xliv. (xlv.) 1.

1 I poured out praise to the Lord;
For I am His:

2 And I will speak His holy song,[2]
For my heart is with Him.

3 For His Harp is in my hands,
And the Odes of His Rest shall not be silent.

Cf. Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 145.

4 I will cry unto Him from my whole heart;
I will praise and exalt Him with[3] all my members.

Ps. cvi. (cvii.) 3.

5 For from the East and even to the West
Is His praise:[4]

6 And from the South and even to the North
Is His confession:[5]

Cf. Gen. xlix. 26.

7 And from the top of the hills to their utmost bound
Is His perfection.[6]

Ps. cvi. (cvii.) 8, &c.

8 Who can write the Odes of the Lord,
Or who read them!

[1] Quoted by Wensinck, *The Dove* of Bar Hebraeus, p. lxxxvii. [2] *Lit.* Ode. [3] *Lit.* from. [4] *Lit.* Praise is His. [5] *Lit.* Confession is His. We may also translate: Thanks are to Him. [6] *Or*, The perfectionment (the finish) is His.

Digitized by Google

9 Or who can train his soul for life,
That his soul may be saved?

10 Or who can rest on the Most High,
That from His mouth he may speak?

11 Who is able to interpret the wonders of the Lord? Cf. Ps. cv. (cvi.) 2.
For he who interprets would be dissolved,
And that which was interpreted will remain.

12 For it suffices to know and to rest;
For in the rest the singers stand;

13 Like a river which has an abundant fountain,
And flows to the help of them that seek it.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. The opening reflects Psalm xliv. (xlv.) 1 in the Syriac, not only in the use of the verb ܐܒܥ, but in the sequence of a future tense to a past; 'I poured out', 'I will speak'. There is therefore no need to change the tense of the opening verse as Charles suggests.

v. 7. Frankenberg unnecessarily proposes to eliminate the corroborative *Hé* of ܫܘܒܚܗ.

vv. 8–10. We may translate this construction as optative:

'Oh! that one could write the Odes!
Or read them!
Oh! that,' &c.

v. 11. If ܡܛܠ meaning 'because' is separated by a particle from the noun, verb, or pronoun, the letter ܕ can be omitted, although its retention is preferable. In the present verse H has no ܕ before ܗܘ but B has it. In the text the note 'B ܕܗܘ' must be changed accordingly to 'H ܗܘ'.

v. 13. The Ode here returns to its keynote ܐܒܥ ('I poured out'), with the reference to the 'abundant fountain' (ܡܒܘܥܐ).

Digitized by Google

Expository Notes.

This beautiful song of praise is founded on various passages in the canonical Psalter and elsewhere; in particular, the Odist has in his mind the 107th Psalm in which the writer calls upon men to praise (ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, give thanks to) the Lord for his goodness; especially the redeemed are exhorted who have been gathered from the East and West and North and South. Accordingly the Odist says:

‘From the East and even to the West
Is His praise:
From the South even to the North
Is His thanksgiving’ (ܬܘܕܝܬܐ = ἐξομολόγησις).

The refrain of the 107th Psalm is in the words,

‘Oh! that men would praise the Lord for His goodness:
And for His wonderful works to the children of men.’

This provokes the question on the part of the Odist:

‘Who is able to write the Odes of the Lord?[1]
. . . .
Who is able to interpret the wonders of the Lord?’

Gressmann has suggested that for ܙܡܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܐ (‘Psalms of the Lord’) we should read ܕܡܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܐ (‘mirabilia domini’); we should thus have two slightly different translations of the ‘wonderful works’ of the Psalmist: so the Odist may have been working from the LXX (θαυμάσια) or translating the Hebrew text or its Targum. (The Peshiṭta appears to have omitted the word altogether.) In verse 24, however, where the word occurs again (‘his wonders in the deep’), the Peshiṭta renders it by ܬܕܡܪ̈ܬܐ exactly as in verse 11 of the Ode.

In the concluding verses the Odist equates or couples together Knowledge and Rest; something of the same kind occurs in Clement of Alexandria (*Paedagogus*, i. 6, p. 115):

ἡ μὲν γνῶσις ἐν τῷ φωτίσματι· τὸ δὲ πέρας τῆς γνώσεως, ἡ ἀνάπαυσις.

[1] Or better still, in agreement with the grammatical suggestion of an optative,

‘Oh! that one could write the Odes [? wonders] of the Lord!
Or [that one could] read [proclaim] them!’

Digitized by Google

This divine Rest is here described as a river with an abundant fountain by which the singers stand. It is the same as the *plenteous fountain of the Lord* in Ode xi, and we shall find it again in Ode xxx, where there is an invitation to '*rest by the fountain of the Lord*', and those who drink therefrom find *rest* thereby. Thus these Odes are internally connected and have the same author.

Eusebius in his *Theophania* (Bk. i, c. 23) uses the same figure of the Word of God, the Logos, which is

> 'as a river flowing from an unlimited fountain . . . to those who were perishing.'

This is taken from his *de laudibus Constantini* (c. xii, p. 462, ed. Heinechen):

> Ὡς ἐξ ἀενάου καὶ ἀπείρου πηγῆς ἀνομβρῶν λόγοις ἀρρήτοις, ποταμοῦ δίκην πρόεισιν, ὅλος πλημμυρῶν ἐς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς τοῦ παντὸς σωτηρίας.

If we assume as suggested in the critical note that the passage in verses 8–10 is to be translated by a series of optatives, we must find a more harmonious translation of the words, 'He that could interpret would be dissolved'. Now there is no doubt that the refrain of the 107th Psalm which the Odist is imitating is optative: all the great English interpreters, except the Geneva translators, render it, 'Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness, &c.'[1] and so did the Coptic translators of the LXX. Amongst modern translators Wellhausen (in the Polychrome Bible) renders it:

> 'May they give thanks to J H V H for His goodness and for the wonders which he does for men.'

No doubt this is the right line for the translator; and the coincidence with the Odes in optative expression is very clear. To be consistent with the thought of the Odist we should then translate the concluding part of the optation as follows:

> 'O that one were able to interpret the wonders of the Lord!
> For though he who could interpret were to be dissolved, yet that
> which is interpreted would remain.'

We have seen that this Ode is, to a large extent, based on the Syriac of Psalm cvii; but the opening clauses which constitute the Odist's own

[1] See Aldis Wright, *Hexaplar Psalter*.

prelude, are an imitation of the opening of the 45th Psalm, similar to what we came across in the 21st Ode.

The very first word ܐܒܥ betrays its origin: it is the equivalent of the Greek ἐξερεύξατο and its companion Latin *eructavit*. Only there is this variation from Ode xxi; the 'heart' is left to the next verse:

'I will speak His holy song,
For *my heart* is with Him.'

Here we have two verses in the Ode made out of a single clause in the Psalter. The link between the two is the Peshiṭta version.

The expression

'I will *speak* His holy song',

probably goes back to the Targum, where we find

'my heart pours out a good *speech* (ממלל)',

where the Peshiṭta has ܡܠܬܐ, which does not as readily give the meaning of 'discourse' though it is in the Odes one of the equivalents of the Greek 'Logos'.

ODE XXVII

1 I expanded my hands: and I sanctified (them) to my Lord[1]:
For the expansion of my hands is His sign.

2 And my expansion
Is the upright wood.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. Linguistically it is possible to translate 'and I sanctified (them) to the Lord', i.e. my hands; the pronoun in the case, ܐܢܝܢ, being frequently omitted by the writers of such sentences.

v. 3. In view of the unwarranted assertions of some scholars it is useful to remark (*a*) that the word ܩܝܣܐ 'wood' refers frequently in

[1] *Or*, I sanctified my Lord.

Digitized by Google

Syriac literature to *the Cross*, and (*b*) that this wood-cross is commonly compared with the wood-tree of Paradise, the one as being the source of death, and the other of life (see Ephrem, *R. E.* ii 13, &c.; *Breviarium Chaldaicum*, ii, p. ܡܚܪ, &c.).

Expository Notes.

There can be no doubt that this Psalm is based upon the early Christian attitude in prayer, which was cruciform, and upon the habit of the early Christians of finding the Cross everywhere in the outward world; e.g. in the handle of the labourer's plough and in the mast and yards of the seaman's ship. The figurative language employed is characteristic of the second century and not unknown in the first. Justin Martyr, for instance, and Barnabas, see the Cross in the outspread arms of Moses in the battle against Amalek; and it is possible that our Nitrian MS. had this in mind in reading

'the extension of my hands *is weary*;'

the reading of the other MS. would require correction to ܠܐܐ ܗܘܐ, for ܡܬܚܐ (extension) is masculine. We find the same figure in the *Teaching of the Apostles* as the sign of the Advent, perhaps the same as the sign of the Son of Man in Matthew.

Very nearly the same language as that of our little Ode is used to introduce the closing Ode of the collection, where it is not a mere repetition, but an integral part of the Ode, as we shall see. So we note again the interdependence and unity of the separate elements of the collection.

ODE XXVIII

1 As the wings of doves over their nestlings,
And the mouths of their nestlings towards their mouths;
So also are the wings of the Spirit over my heart.

2 My heart is delighted and leaps up,
Like the babe who leaps up in the womb of his mother: Cf. Luke i. 44.

Digitized by Google

Cf. Ps. cxv. (cxvi.) 10, and 2 Cor. iv. 13, Heb. iv. 3.

3 I believed; therefore I was at rest:
For faithful is He in whom I have believed.

Cf. Gen. xxii. 16.

4a He has richly blessed me;[1]
And my head is with Him.

Cf. Rom. viii. 35.

4b And the sword shall not divide me from Him,
Nor the scimitar.

5 For I was ready before destruction came;
And I have been set on His immortal[2] pinions;

6 And deathless life embraced me
And kissed me.

7 And from that (life) is the Spirit within me;
And it cannot die, for it lives.

(Christ speaks.)

8 They who saw me marvelled at me,
Because I was persecuted;

9 And they supposed that I was swallowed up;
For I seemed to them as one of the lost.

10 But my oppression
Became my salvation.

11 And I was their scorn,
Because there was no wrath[3] in me.

12 Because I did good to every man
I was hated;

[1] *Lit.* Blessing He has blessed me.
[2] *Or*, incorruptible.
[3] *Or*, zeal, envy.

Digitized by Google

13 And they cme round me like mad dogs; Cf. Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 16.
Who ignorantly attack their masters. Euseb. *D. E.* x. (p. 505).

14 For their thought is corrupt
And their understanding perverted.

15 But I was carrying water in my right hand,
And their bitterness I endured[1] by my sweetness.

16 And I did not perish, for I was not their brother,
Nor was my birth like theirs.[2]

17 And they sought for my death and could not (accomplish it);
For I was older than the memorial of them;
And vainly did they cast lots against[3] me. Cf. Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 18.

18 And those who came after me
Sought without cause to destroy the memorial of him who was before them. Cf. Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 161.

19 For the thought of the Most High cannot be anticipated;
And His heart is superior to all wisdom.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. H has the singular ܘܦܘܡܐ ('and the mouth').

v. 15. Perhaps a half-verse has dropped and we should restore,

'I carried water in my right hand,
That I might put out their flame;
(ܕܐܕܥܟ ܫܠܗܒܝܬܗܘܢ)
And their bitterness I endured
By my sweetness.'

For the antithesis in the last lines, cf. Aphrahat, i. 423, 'Sweetness overcomes bitterness.'

[1] *Or*, I forgot (B). [2] *Or*, Nor did they acknowledge my birth (B).
[3] *Or*, threaten me (H).

Digitized by Google

The text of the MS. is much better than the unnecessary emendations by Frankenberg of ܡܚܬܐ (which he considers meaningless) into ܡܚܝܐ, and of ܒܡܫܡܫܝܢ into ܒܡܫܡܫܝܢ.

v. 17. If we follow the reading of B and the margin of H, there is perhaps a parallel to the casting of lots over the Saviour's raiment, but the contexts are not similar. In verse 18 we are near to the language of the 119th Psalm [Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 161], but there is no special coincidence with the Peshitta.

v. 19. The contracted form ܣܡܡܐ of the manuscripts is much more forceful in the sentence than the absolute proposed by Diettrich and Grimme.

Expository Notes.

This Ode, opening with a similitude, belongs in that regard with Odes xiv–xvi: but it may also be grouped with those Odes in which Christ becomes the chief speaker, for here the change of personality can clearly be made out. At the eighth verse, and until the end of the Ode, we are listening to the poet-prophet who speaks for Christ and as Christ. Perhaps the last verse of all may be detached for a choral refrain. The parallel between the 'wings of doves' and the 'wings of the Spirit' arises from the symbolism of the Spirit as a dove. We may compare Bar Hebraeus, *The Dove* (introd.): 'The Dove abides in the East but the West is full of her. Her food is fire, and he who is *crowned by her with wings* will breathe forth flames from his mouth.'

There may be a cross-reference here to Ps. liv. (lv.). 7: 'O that I had wings like a dove, then would I fly away and be at rest'; for the Odist goes on, 'I believed, therefore I was at rest'.

It is comparatively easy to detect the Old Testament passages which are in the mind of the Odist: we have shown in the Introduction the use that is made of the verse

'They came round me like mad dogs
Who ignorantly attack their Master:'

and how it is quoted, from the Ode, by Eusebius and others; but it was also clear that the origin of the passage was to be sought in the 22nd Psalm:

ἐκύκλωσάν με κύνες πολλοί.—Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 17.

Digitized by Google

We may correct the reading of the manuscripts from 'their masters' to 'their Master', in accordance with the Patristic evidence; but the meaning can be deduced without any alteration of the text. The change had already been divined by Flemming and Labourt.

This recognition of the use of the 22nd Psalm carried with it the justification of the reading of the Nitrian MS. and the margin of the Rylands MS.:

'they cast lots against me.'

We can also see now the reason why in verse 15 the Odist says:

'Their bitterness I endured by my sweetness.'

The 'bitterness' comes from the companion Psalm (lxix. 22) where

'They gave me gall for my meat
And for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.'

The Peshiṭta actually has 'bitterness' (ܡܪܪܐ) in this passage.

The statement that 'those who saw me marvelled at me' (verse 8) with which Christ's address begins, occurs again in Ode xvii (again as the opening words of Christ); and in Ode xli (a similar opening); it is derived from the 71st Psalm:

ὡσεὶ τέρας ἐγενήθην τοῖς πολλοῖς.—Ps. lxx. (lxxi.) 7.

Let us compare the language of the Ode with the Peshiṭta:

Ode xxviii. 8. ܐܬܕܡܪܘ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܚܙܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܝ

Ps. lxx. (lxxi.) 7. ܕܡܘܪܐ ܗܘܝܬ ܠܣܓܝܐܐ

The agreement in the use of ܕܡܪ shows the dependence of the Odist upon the Peshiṭta.

In Ode xli. 8 the coincidence is equally exact, for here we have:

ܢܬܕܡܪܘܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܚܙܝܢ ܒܝ

In Ode xvii another word is used.

The reference to the carrying of the water in one's right hand in verse 15 is explained above by the insertion of a conjectural clause,

'that I might put out their flame';

perhaps no explanation is necessary; the thing explains itself; the dogs were mad and would run away at the sight of water. *Hydrophoria*, if we may say so, was the natural cure for *hydrophobia*.

Digitized by Google

v. 4. This verse has been quoted to show the manner in which the Odist makes use of passages from the Scripture, notably from the Psalms: he takes what he wants and changes what he wishes. Thus the quotations are disguised, and are only recognized in the unaltered portions. Connolly uses this passage to prove a Greek original for the Odes; for in the LXX as well as in the quotation of the LXX in 2 Cor. iv. 13, we have

ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα.

Now this διό is wanting in the Peshiṭta of the Psalm that is being imitated: so it is suggested that the Odist depends directly on the Septuagint and not on the Syriac version. There is, however, another possibility: the connecting particle may come from the Targum. A reference shows as follows:

Ps. cxvi. 10. חימנית ארום אמלל

so it seems that we are not obliged to relate the Odist to the Septuagint.

This does not mean that the Odist was unacquainted with the Septuagint; that is another matter.

In verses 16, 17, we have strong theological statements that the Christ is the Only-begotten (Monogenēs) and that he was miraculously born. Illustrations of these points will be found in our Introduction.

ODE XXIX

Ps. xxx. (xxxi.) 1.

1 The Lord is my hope:
In Him I shall not be confounded.

2 For according to His praise He made me,
And according to His goodness[1] even so He gave unto me.

3 And according to His mercies He exalted me;
And according to His excellent beauty He set me on high.

4 And He brought me up out of the depths of Sheol;
And from the mouth of death He drew me.

[1] *Or*, grace (B).

Digitized by Google

5 And I laid my enemies low;
And He justified me by His grace.

6 For I believed in the Lord's Messiah;
And He appeared to me that He is the Lord.

7 And He showed me His sign,
And led me by His light;

8 And He gave me the rod of His power; Ps. cix. (cx.) 2.
That I might subdue the imaginations of the people: Cf. Ps. xxxii. (xxxiii.) 10.
And to bring down the power of the men of might.

9 To make war by His Word;
And to take victory by His power.

10 And the Lord overthrew my enemy by His Word;
And he became like the stubble which the wind carries away. Ps. i. 4.

11 And I gave praise to the Most High;
Because He exalted His servant and the Son of His handmaid. Ps. cxv. (cxvi.) 16.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 5. Instead of ܘܡܟܟܬ 'and I have laid low', or 'Thou hast laid low', to put the verb in harmony with the context one might suggest ܘܡܟܟ 'And He laid low'.

v. 6. In the Syriac versions of the New Testament, and in Syriac literature in general, ܐܬܚܙܝ ܠܝ has been sometimes used in the sense of 'I saw', 'I noticed', instead of 'He was seen by me', 'He appeared to me' (John ix. 11). This applies also to Ode xvii. 10. We could therefore translate here, 'And I saw that He was the Lord'.

vv. 8, 10. In these two verses the language is certainly borrowed from the Psalter; but, strange to say, in neither case is the phraseology that of

Digitized by Google

the Peshiṭta: one would have supposed that at least the first Psalm would have had its language imitated. It is to be noted, however, that Aphrahat quotes Psalm i. 4 with ܥܡܠܐ as in our Ode (ii. 117).

v. 10. Grimme believes that the word ܒܡܠܬܗ is a dittographical error of the copyist.

Expository Notes.

This Ode is more like a cento from the Psalter than an interpretation of a single Psalm, such as we have had several cases of.

The first verse is imitated from the opening verse of the 31st Psalm:

Ἐπὶ σοί, Κύριε, ἤλπισα, μὴ καταισχυνθείην εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
Ps. xxx. (xxxi.) 1.

The closeness of the agreement with the Peshiṭta may be noted:

Ode xxx. ܡܪܝܐ ܗܘ ܣܒܪܝ ܠܐ ܐܒܗܬ ܒܗ
Ps. xxx. (xxxi.). ܒܟ ܡܪܝܐ ܣܒܪܬ ܠܐ ܐܒܗܬ ܠܥܠܡ

In verses 3, 4, we may, perhaps, see the influence of the 85th Psalm:

ὅτι τὸ ἔλεός σου μέγα ἐπ' ἐμέ,
καὶ ἐρρύσω τὴν ψυχήν μου
ἐξ ᾅδου κατωτάτου.
Ps. lxxxv. (lxxxvi.) 13.

In that case we may take verse 7:

'He led me by His light.'

as dependent upon the 11th verse of the Psalm,

ὁδήγησόν με, Κύριε, τῇ ὁδῷ σου·

The eighth verse of the Ode is composite. The first clause:

'He gave me the rod of His power,'

is certainly based on Psalm cix. (cx.) 2, and Christ should be the speaker. For 'rod of power' the Ode has

ܫܒܛܐ ܕܚܝܠܬܢܘܬܗ

while the Peshiṭta has:

ܫܒܛܐ ܕܥܘܫܢܐ

The next clause is from the 33rd Psalm. We may compare the Ode and the Peshiṭta:

Ode xxix. 8: ܕܐܡܟܟ ܡܚܫ̈ܒܬܐ ܕܥܡ̈ܡܐ
Ps. xxxii. (xxxiii.) 10. ܘܡܒܛܠ ܡܪܝܐ ܡܚܫ̈ܒܬܐ ܕܥܡ̈ܡܐ

Digitized by Google

We cannot be quite sure about the dependence of the Ode on the Syriac Psalm from the coincidences, which appear to be natural.

The closing verse of the Ode may be due to the 116th Psalm (v. 7), or perhaps to the 85th Psalm:

δὸς τὸ κράτος σου τῷ παιδί σου,
καὶ σῶσον τὸν υἱὸν τῆς παιδίσκης σου.
Ps. lxxxv (lxxxvi). 16.

The discrimination of the parts of the Ode in which Christ speaks is difficult. In some ways it looks more like a dialogue. Verses 6, 7 might be the poet's experience, verses 8–10 the Lord's, and the closing verse again the poet.

v. 7. The recognition of the fact that in this verse the Odist is under the influence of the 110th Psalm will help us to clear up some of the sentences which follow; twice we have a reference to the Word of God:

'To make war by His Word;'
'The Lord cast down my enemies by His Word.'

From these two clauses it is clear that the war at the instance of the Word has the consequence of victory by the one who orders the war to commence. But this is the opening verse of the Psalm, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit at my right hand until I make thy enemies the footstool of thy feet'.

Now turn to the Targum, and observe that in the opening verse the explanation is made, that the Lord said '*by His Word*'. This is very interesting and important; it shows that the Word in our Ode is to have a capital letter: in the Syriac it is *Melletha*, and not in this case *Pethgama*; that is the word which finally takes its place in Syriac to express the Logos.

This appears finally to rule out the idea that Christ is the speaker in this part of the Ode: for the speaker who gets the rod of power and takes the victory, gets it from the Word and therefore is not himself the Word. It appears, then, that the 110th Psalm could be used to express the experience of a believer in Christ as well as of Christ Himself.

In the Targum the Word is represented by *Memra*; this is the first instance we have found of the appearance of the *Memra* in the history of the doctrine of the Logos.

Digitized by Google

ODE XXX

1 Fill ye water for yourselves from the living fountain of the Lord:
For it has been opened to you:

2 And come all ye thirsty and take a draught;
And rest by the fountain of the Lord.

3 For fair it is and pure;
And it gives rest to the soul.

Ps. xviii. (xix.) 11. Sir. xxiv. 20.

4 Much sweeter is its water than honey;
And the honeycomb of bees is not to be compared with it.

Sir. xxiv. 3.

5 For it flows from the lips of the Lord,
And from the heart of the Lord is its name.

6 And it came unlimited and invisible;
And until it was set in the midst they did not know it.

7 Blessed are they who have drunk therefrom;
And rested thereby.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. The language of this verse, 'Fill yourselves water', for 'draw water' or 'get water' is decidedly Aramaic; we may compare Isa. xii. 3, 'ye shall draw water out of the wells of salvation'; here the Hebrew and the Greek suggest 'draw' but the Peshiṭta agrees with the language of the Ode: 'ye shall fill water'; thus the Aramaism is indisputable. The parallel adduced shows, however, that it would arise in translation. The same thing occurs in John iv. 7, where ἀντλῆσαι is rendered by 'fill,' in the Syriac versions.

Digitized by Google

v. 4. Note that the writer, while using Biblical terms (Ps. xix. 11), does not follow the Peshiṭta, but may very well be interpreting the Hebrew מתוק (*pleasant* or *sweet*).

v. 5. 'Its name' does not seem to offer a satisfactory meaning; it may perhaps be ܫܦܥܗ 'its overflow'.

Frankenberg has suggested that 'name' (ὄνομα) is a misunderstanding of νᾶμα, 'flow', 'stream': an excellent case for the defenders of the hypothesis of a Greek original.

v. 6. Connolly suggests that the Syriac word ܡܨܥܬܐ means simply 'the middle' without any meaning of 'in medio ponere', which is attached to τιθέναι, 'to publish, to bring forward openly'. If the phrase of the Odes seems to some critics to require such an interpretation, it is useful to remark that Syriac literature abounds in expressions such as ܣܡ ܒܡܨܥܬܐ or ܐܝܬܝ ܠܡܨܥܬܐ precisely in the sense of 'in medio ponere'; e.g. in Ephrem, ܣܝܡܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܡܨܥܬܐ (*R. E.* ii. 388, iii. 179, 192, &c.).

Expository Notes.

We have already alluded to this Ode as containing the same doctrine of the abundant fountain of the Lord as is found in other Odes (and, we may add, in the Epistle of Barnabas, *v. supra*). We also referred to the Ode as containing in itself a strong suggestion of a Greek original, if we were to accept Frankenberg's suggestion that in verse 5 ὄνομα has been misread for νᾶμα. We might illustrate the language from Theodoret (*P. G.* 80, 869).

> Μιμεῖται γὰρ ὑδάτων ἀρδείαν τὰ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος νάματα . . . οὗ δὴ χάριν καὶ ὁ Δεσπότης Χριστὸς ὕδωρ τὴν οἰκείαν διδασκαλίαν ὀνομάζει.

The reference to the honey and the honeycomb in verse 3 takes us naturally to the 19th Psalm; there is, however, another possible source: in the Wisdom of Sirach, we have in the chapter on the Praise of Wisdom as follows:

> τὸ γὰρ μνημόσυνόν μου ὑπὲρ μέλι γλυκύ,
> καὶ ἡ κληρονομία μου ὑπὲρ μέλιτος κηροῦ.
> Sirach, xxiv. 20.

And since the speech of Wisdom begins with the words:

'I came forth from the mouth of the Most High,'

we have a good parallel to:

'It comes forth from the lips of the Lord.'

This would mean that the water is the knowledge of the Lord, as it is in the sixth Ode, and that the Odist has been studying this chapter of Sirach.

We have noticed above the Syriacism which is involved in the words with which the Ode opens, '*Fill* ye water'; e.g. Isaiah xii. 3, 'and ye shall *fill* water with joy from the fountains of salvation'.

If the language of the Ode is that of a translator, it is good idiomatic translation.

It will be noticed that the coincidence between Ode xxx and Sirach xxiv is more clear when we translate literally, and instead of saying, as in the first rendering, 'It flows forth from the lips of the Lord', we say 'It comes forth' or 'it came forth'. This brings us very close to the language of Sirach. It may be noted in passing that the statement in Sirach, as in so many other cases, is an adaptation of the Hebrew in Prov. ii. 6:

'The Lord giveth Wisdom:
Out of His mouth (LXX ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ) cometh knowledge and understanding.'

This is what the Wisdom of Sirach meant by 'I came forth from the mouth of the Most High'; and this is what the Odist took from Sirach. It is abundantly clear that the flowing stream of which the Ode speaks is the Knowledge of the Lord, as it has been equally recognized in Ode vi.

We give special attention to Frankenberg's emendation (νᾶμα for ὄνομα) in verse 5, because the parallelism of the verses seems to require a correction; moreover, since we have no evidence for an early Syriac text of Sirach, the claim is very strong for a Greek original and a Greek emendation. On the other hand, a Syriac emendation might be ventured, as above, and one which would have support in the existing Peshiṭta text of Sirach which Frankenberg's emendation does not. Suppose that instead of ܫܡܗ ('His name') we read ܫܦܥܗ ('its outflow') this would answer to the Syriac

ܘܡܫܦܥܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܢܗܪܐ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܝ

'I *pour out* like the river (Jordan) my teaching.'

Digitized by Google

The corresponding Greek word is not νᾶμα but διῶρυξ. Evidently we must be on our guard against too rapid conclusions or generalizations. What we are certain of is the use by the Odist of the Sapiential books. We may, for instance, be as sure that he uses Sirach as we are certain that Sirach imitates Proverbs.

ODE XXXI

1 The abysses were dissolved before the Lord;
And darkness was destroyed by His appearance.

2a Error went astray
And disappeared from Him,
2b And (as for) Falsehood, I gave it no path,
And it was submerged by the truth of the Lord.

3 He opened His mouth and spake grace and joy;
And He spake a new (song of) praise to His name.

4 And He lifted up His voice to the Most High, Cf. Isa. viii. 18;
And offered to Him the sons that were in His hands.[1] Heb. ii. 13.

5 And His face was justified;
For thus His Holy Father had given[2] to Him.

(Christ speaks.)

6 Come forth, ye that have been afflicted,
And receive joy.

7 And possess[3] your souls by grace;
And take to you immortal life,

[1] *Or*, those that had become children by His means (John i. 12); *or*, the sons given Him by God.
[2] *Or*, done.
[3] *Lit.* inherit.

Digitized by Google

8 And they condemned me when I rose up;[1]
Me who had not been condemned.[2]

9 And they divided my spoil,
Though nothing was due to them.

10 But I endured and held my peace and was silent,
That I might not be moved by them.

Cf. Aphr. i. 7.

11 But I stood unshaken like a firm rock,
That is beaten by the waves and endures.

12 And I bore their bitterness for humility's sake;
That I might redeem my people and inherit it.

Cf. Rom. xv. 8 and Barnab. 5.

13 And that I might not make void the promises to the patriarchs
To whom I was promised for the salvation of their seed.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 2. The second member of this verse is very difficult owing to a possible corruption of the text. As it stands in B it runs: 'Wickedness received immobility, and was submerged by the truth of the Lord'. The suffix ܗ̇, however, makes the Syriac wording very harsh and ungrammatical. For ܠܐ ܗܠܟܬܐ we have suggested ܠܗ̇ ܗܠܟܬܐ, and to make the metaphor more in harmony with the first member of the verse we have suggested ܛܥܝܬ for ܛܒܥܬ. 'Wickedness took for herself the power of motion and erred from the truth of the Lord.' This is grammatically correct and in accordance with the first part of the parallelism.

For ܡܟܝܟܘܬܐ which more generally means 'meanness', 'lowliness', we should, perhaps read ܡܗܝܟܘܬܐ as in Ode xi. 10. The 'run of error', 'evil', 'truth', &c., is a favourite metaphor of the Odist, see Odes xxxviii. 6, xviii. 6; but the change is, perhaps, somewhat violent.

[1] *Or*, I stood up. [2] *Or*, culprit.

Digitized by Google

However this may be, a good meaning is given in H if we translate: 'And wickedness gave to it (to error) no path, and it was submerged by the truth of the Lord,' or 'And vanity (or falsehood), I gave to it immobility, and it was submerged by the truth of the Lord.' This meaning is grammatically good, and we can adopt it in the absence of a better one. In our note to the text: 'H ܡܘܟܬܗ (*sic!*)' is erroneous. The reading of H is contained in the text itself.

v. 6. Labourt suggests that instead of ܚܕܘܬܐ 'joy' we might read ܚܐܪܘܬܐ 'liberty'; this, however, is not necessary; the beginning of the verse is speaking of people in pain.

v. 8. More generally the verb ܚܝܒ means 'to condemn' (as culprit); the sense of making somebody debtor to a creditor is usually expressed in Syriac by means of a periphrase. That in this sentence the meaning of the verb refers probably to 'a condemnation' is borne out by the participle ܡܚܝܒܐ which is seldom found in the sense of a debtor in money; ܚܝܒܐ is used in this last sense, and is also commonly used in both senses of 'debtor' and 'culprit'. Notice in the text of the next line the Syriacism ܠܗܘ instead of ܐܢܐ ('they condemned me, him who . . .').

v. 9. The verb ܐܬܚܝܒ with a ܠ is always used in the sense of something being due to somebody; about this there is no doubt. It seems, therefore, as if there was a play on the different meanings of the verb as used in the preceding verse. If there is no such paronomasia, we maintain parallelism by translating 'debt' and 'debtor' throughout.

v. 12. There is no need to read with Grimme ܡܣܡܣܢܬ for ܡܣܡܣܢܬܐ.

v. 13. The rules laid down by the grammarians from the 11th century onwards to the effect that in the passive form we should redouble the ܬ of the *Hamzed* or assimilated verbs in the form ܐܬܦܥܠ is not much followed in the manuscripts. It is possible, therefore, that ܐܬܦܪܩܬ is used here by the scribe for ܐܬܬܦܪܩܬ. This is even the case in the old manuscripts for any other verb; e.g. the Lewis text has in Luke i. 4 ܕܐܬܠܡܕܬ for ܕܐܬܬܠܡܕܬ; ibid., 16, 25, ܡܬܠܝܢ for ܡܬܬܠܝܢ, &c.

Expository Notes.

This Ode is somewhat like the 28th Ode in that it contains a selection of statements from the 22nd Psalm, for the most part expounded by

Digitized by Google

Christ in His own person. The writer opens with a couple of introductory verses on Truth and Error; then he approaches the 22nd Psalm in the verse:

> 'I will declare *thy name* unto my brethren;
> In the midst of the Church I will *sing praise* unto thee;'
> Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 22.

This he reproduces as:

> 'He spake a new *song of praise to His name*.'—Ode xxxi. 4.

He follows this with a reference to the 'children that God had given Him'; this is exactly the sequence which we find (awkwardly introduced) in Hebrews ii. 13, where it comes as a quotation from Isaiah viii. 17, 18. The Odist is not quoting Hebrews, but the sources of Hebrews in a collection of *Testimonia*. The reference to God's gift of children is in the next verse:

> 'Thus His Holy Father had *given* Him.'

Very likely this is implied in the previous verse, if we follow the Nitrian MS., for here we have:

> 'The children who were by His hand,' i. e. the children given by God.

There is no doubt, then, that the Odist is working on the 22nd Psalm.

Christ now becomes the speaker, and his address is marked by further reference to the same Psalm; for instance, the words 'they *divided* my spoil', i. e. 'they despoiled me and divided the plunder', is an adaptation of the 18th verse of the Psalm:

> 'They divide my garments among them,
> they cast lots upon my vesture.'

In verse 12 the Odist repeats very nearly what he had said in Ode xxviii about 'bearing their bitterness', but the word for 'bearing' is now ܣܒܠ instead of ܛܥܢ. Apparently the Odist has changed the word; the origin of the 'bitterness' is, as we have shown, to be sought in the Psalm. The word *endure* should be noticed, because the writer emphasizes it, and because it occurs in the quotation which Barnabas makes of the last verse of the Ode.

Probably there are more loans from the Canonical Psalter to be traced.

Digitized by Google

ODE XXXII

1 To the blessed the joy is from their hearts,
And light from Him that dwells in them;

2 And the Word from the Truth who is self-originate.

3 For He hath been strengthened by the Holy Power of the Most High,
And He is unperturbed for ever and ever.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 3. It is difficult to ascertain who is the 'unshakable' or 'unperturbed'. The pronoun ܗܘܝܘ can refer to ܡܡܠܠܐ 'the Word', or to ܚܝܠܗ ܕܡܪܝܡܐ 'the strength of the Most High', or to the 'Most High' Himself. The first meaning is, however, the more tempting. There is no necessity to read with Grimme ܕܐܬܚܝܠܘ in plural.

Expository Notes.

We have edited in the second verse ܡܡܠܠܐ in the singular, as expressing the Logos, for, as we have seen, the Odes use this term as well as ܡܠܬܐ to express it. The 'Word from the Truth' is possibly the equivalent for the 'True Word', and finds its parallel in Ode xii:

> 'The Mouth of the Lord is the *True Word*,
> And the door of *His light*.'

For, as the Odist explains, the saints have 'light from Him that dwells within'. This Ode belongs to the group of Wisdom-Odes or Logos-Odes, and so does the one that immediately follows.

Digitized by Google

ODE XXXIII

1 Grace again[1] ran and left the Corruptor
And came down upon him to bring him to naught:

2 And he[2] made utter destruction[3] from before him
And devastated all his array:

3 And he stood on a lofty summit and cried aloud
From one end of the earth to the other;

4 And drew to him all those who obeyed him:
And he did not appear as an evil person;[4]

Cf. Prov. i. 20–21 and viii. 1 sq.

5 But a perfect virgin stood
Who was proclaiming and crying and saying:

(Wisdom speaks.)

6 O ye sons of men, return ye;
And ye their daughters, come ye;

7 And leave the ways of that Corruptor,
And draw near unto me;

8 And I will enter into you
And bring you forth from destruction;
And I will make you wise in the ways of truth.

9 Be not destroyed;
Nor perish.

10 Hear ye me and be saved;
For the grace of God I am telling among you:

[1] *Lit.* but again.
[2] *i.e.* the Corruptor.
[3] *Lit.* And He destroyed the destruction.
[4] *Or*, as the Evil One.

Digitized by Google

11 And by my means you shall be redeemed and become
blessed:
I am your judge;[1]

12 And they who have put me on shall not be injured: Cf. Eph. iv. 24.
But they shall possess incorruption in the new world.

13 My chosen ones have walked in me, Cf. Col. ii. 6.
And my ways I will make known to them that seek me;
And I will make them to trust in my name.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. The verb ܦܚܡܬ is difficult to understand if we read the word ܠܚܒܳܠܐ 'corruption' as we have punctuated it, and as it is in the manuscript. If we punctuate it ܠܚܰܒܳܠܐ we should have 'the corruptor' (cf. Ode xxxviii. 9) with a sense appropriate to the context. This disposes of many theories involving the change of the verb into ܦܓܥܬ, ܠܚܡܬ, and ܦܨܡܬ, &c.

v. 2. The Semitism of 'he made utter destruction' should be noted.

The expression ܚܒܠ ܠܛܘܟܣܐ 'to devastate one's array, preparations, or possessions' is frequent in Ephrem, see Mitchell's edition, p. 5.

v. 4. Labourt's suggestion that the text should be ܘܠܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ ܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܪܫܐ 'and he did not appear to them as the head', is not necessary.

v. 5. It is unnecessary to change ܒܬܘܠܬܐ 'virgin' into ܒܬܘܠܕܬܐ 'in the generation', as Grimme has suggested.

That the perfect Virgin is Wisdom (or Christ speaking as Sophia) may be seen by comparing the language with Proverbs i. 20, 21, or Proverbs viii. 1 sqq.

v. 8. 'I will make you wise in the ways of truth'. That Wisdom is here considered as Light may be inferred from the expression 'those who put me on shall not be injured', where the language should be

[1] *Or*, judgement.

Digitized by Google

compared with Ode xxi. 3, 'I put off Darkness and clothed myself with Light'. We may also compare the 'Light of Truth' in Ode xxxviii. 1.

Bardaisan is credited with a belief in a similar Virgin of Light, or Light-Virgin (see Mitchell, *Discourses of Ephrem*, p. 67).

v. 11. We have punctuated the word ܕܝܢܟܘܢ 'your judgement'; the manuscript has ܕܝܢܟܘܢ 'your judge', which suits better the context. Connolly suggests ܙܝܢܟܘܢ 'your armour', which is appropriate. Less probable is the hypothesis of Barth, who reads ܕܝܠܟܘܢ (yours).

v. 12. Grimme unnecessarily suggests the change of the text of the manuscript into ܠܥܠܡܐ and ܠܐ.

Expository Notes.

This Ode seems to begin abruptly and unintelligibly; we suggest that something has been lost at the opening. Apparently it is Christ who appears as Grace, and then as Divine Wisdom, in whose person He speaks from the sixth verse onwards, confuting the Corruptor mentioned in the preceding verses.

The key to the Ode lies in the Proverbs of Solomon, and especially in the eighth chapter. We may compare:

Ode xxxiii. 3. 'He stood on a lofty summit and cried aloud:'

ܩܡ ܥܠ ܪܝܫܐ ܪܡܐ ܘܩܥܐ ܩܠܗ

Ode xxxiii. 5. 'A perfect Virgin stood proclaiming, and crying, and saying':

ܩܡܬ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܓܡܝܪܬܐ
ܕܡܟܪܙܐ ܘܩܪܝܐ ܘܐܡܪܐ

Prov. viii. 1–4. 'On this account Wisdom proclaimeth (?);
For on the lofty summits is Wisdom:
She standeth . . .
She saith . . .
Unto you, O men, I cry.'

ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܐܟܪܙ . . .
ܥܠ ܪܝܫ ܪܡܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܚܟܡܬܐ
ܩܝܡܐ . . . . . .
ܘܐܡܪܐ . . . . . .
ܠܟܘܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܩܪܝܐ ܐܢܐ

Digitized by Google

Ode xxxiii. 6. 'O ye sons of men, return ye,
And ye, their daughters, come ye.'

ܒܢܝ̈ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܬܦܢܘ
ܘܒܢ̈ܬܗܘܢ ܐܬܝ̈ܢ

Prov. viii. 4. 'My voice is to the Sons of Man':

ܘܩܠܝ ܠܘܬ ܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ

Ode xxxiii. 8. 'I will make you *wise* in the *ways* of truth.'

ܘܐܚܟܡܟܘܢ ܒܐܘܪܚܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ

v. 11. 'By my means you shall be redeemed and become *blessed*':

ܘܒܐܝܕܝ ܬܬܦܪܩܘܢ ܘܬܗܘܘܢ ܛܘܒܢܐ

Prov. viii. 32, 33. '*Blessed* are they that keep *my ways*;
Hear instruction and *be wise*.'

ܛܘܒܝܗܘܢ ܠܡܢ ܕܢܛܪ ܐܘܪܚܬܝ
ܫܡܥܘ ܡܪܕܘܬܐ ܘܐܬܚܟܡܘ

Thus one principal motive of the Ode is the invitation of Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs, and with that Wisdom Christ is identified.

There are some unexplained allusions and unrecognized references, e.g. there is the 'Corruptor' who is twice referred to, who will turn up again in Ode xxxviii in just as perplexing a form.

Some further light on the obscurities that remain may probably be obtained by picking up the Sapiential clue. For example, in verse 7:

'Leave the ways of that corruptor and draw near unto me,'

we are very close to the language of Proverbs ix. 4:

'Whoso is simple, let him turn in hither,'

where the LXX says 'let him turn aside *to me*', but the Syriac has 'let him come *unto me*'.

Again, in the sixth verse of the same chapter of Proverbs we have:

'Leave off, ye foolish (or *leave off foolishness*) and live,
And walk in *the way of* understanding;'

Digitized by Google

where the LXX has for the first line

ἀπολείπετε ἀφροσύνην, ἵνα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα βασιλεύσητε.
('Leave off Folly, that ye may reign for ever'),

and the Syriac has

'Cause to rest from your folly, and live.'

Evidently the Odist has personified Folly as the Corruptor; clearly also he has found Everlasting Life in Proverbs.

ODE XXXIV

1 There is no hard way where there is a simple heart;
Nor is there any barrier where the thoughts are upright: — Ephr. *R.E.* ii. 486.

2 Nor is there any storm in the depth of the illuminated thought

3 The one who is surrounded on every side by open country,[1]
Is freed from doubts.[2]

4 The likeness of that which is below — Moses Bar-Kepha (B.M. Add. 2121[a], f. 51 b).
Is that which is above;

5 For everything is above;
And below there is nothing, but it is believed to be by the ignorant.[3]

6 Grace has been revealed for your salvation:
Believe and live and be saved.

Hallelujah.

[1] *Lit.* by every beautiful place.
[2] *Lit.* there is nothing divided in him.
[3] *Lit.* those in whom there is no knowledge.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 1. About the word ܦܫܝܛܐ 'simple', &c., Connolly has argued that it was not the notion of simplicity which was meant by the Odist, but that of 'generosity' underlying the Greek ἁπλοῦς; cf., however, the following sentence of Ephrem:

ܦܫܝܛܐ ܗܘ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܠܦܫܝܛ̈ܐ ii, 486 (*R. E.*)

'The way is plain to the simple.'

In the next line ܡܣܘܬܐ (with a *Zaḳāf* or a *Pathāh* on the *Mīm*) in the sense of 'fence, barrier, partition, obstacle to view', is catalogued in the *Thesaurus* on the authority of the Lexicographers, but unfortunately without any illustrations. The first illustration is this sentence of the Odes of Solomon. Gressmann has changed it, perhaps unnecessarily, into ܡܚܘܬܐ 'Sturz'.

v. 3. This meaning is given by a slight change of ܐܝܟܐ into ܐܝܠܐ, which would make the sentence grammatical and in harmony with the preceding verse, where it is spoken of hard ways, adversities, and tempests. In maintaining ܐܝܟܐ as Connolly does, we should be obliged to take the adjective ܛܒܐ as a substantive-subject, and the place which it occupies would then render the Syriac wording somewhat weak. The meaning, too, which it would give 'where the good is surrounded on all sides, there is in Him nothing divided', is not very clear. Labourt's suggestion that instead of ܛܒܐ we should read ܛܘܪܐ is not probable.

Expository Notes.

It is curious that this little Ode should have, as we have shown, Syrian attestation in two quarters, Ephrem and Moses Bar-Kepha.

It is quite unlike any other Ode and does not proceed from any Scriptural base. Only in the last verse the language of the New Testament appears, and the doctrine of salvation by faith and grace. For the rest, the writer asserts that it is possible to rise out of the apparent world into the real world, and that all hard things become easy when the soul itself is right.

Digitized by Google

ODE XXXV

1 The dew of the Lord distilled rest upon me,[1]
And a cloud of peace it caused to rise over my head;

2 That it might guard me continually;
And it became salvation[2] to me:

3 Everybody was shaken and affrighted;
And there came forth from them a smoke and a judgement:

4 But I was keeping quiet in the ranks[3] of the Lord;
More than shadow[4] was He to me, and more than support:[5]

5 And I was carried like a child by its mother;
Aud He gave me milk, the dew of the Lord.

6 And I grew great by His bounty:
And I rested in His perfection:

7 And I spread out my hands in the lifting up of my soul;
And I directed myself towards the Most High,
And I was redeemed with Him:

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. The verb ܐܛܠ is commonly derived from 'shadow' and means 'to overshadow'. The natural meaning of the sentence is therefore 'the dew of the Lord overshadowed me in quietness'. Here the Odist seems to derive it from ܛܠܐ 'dew', except if we suppose that he is purposely

[1] *Or*, overshadowed me in quietness.
[2] H, in salvation.
[3] *Perhaps* by the Word.
[4] dew (B).
[5] *Lit.* foundation.

Digitized by Google

indulging in the uncommon theme of a dew giving shadow. On the one hand the word ܪܣܣܐ 'dew', of the first line requires a verb implying the sense of rain, on the other the word ܥܢܢܐ 'cloud' of the second line may combine both meanings of shadow and rain, unless in verse 2 we should understand the sentence 'that it might guard me' in the sense of warding off the heat of the sun from the Odist. The sense of 'dew' appears also in verse 5, 'And he gave me milk, the dew of the Lord': but verse 6, 'And I *rested* in his perfection' might possibly imply the sense of 'shadow'. In verse 4 the manuscripts are at variance, for whereas H gives 'More than shadow was He to me', B exhibits 'More than dew was He to me'. The Odist is possibly playing in all these verses on the two words ܛܠܐ and ܛܠܠܐ derived from a common root ܛܠ, perhaps related both to 'shadow' and to 'dew'. This assonance seems to have pleased him so much that he thought it expedient to enhance it by the use of ܛܠܝܐ 'child' in verse 5. On the whole, the natural sense of overshadowing is preferable in the first line.

v. 2. The expression 'it was to me for salvation' is good idiomatic Syriac, but the rendering 'It became my salvation' is preferable, for the expression is taken from Isaiah xii. 2, exactly as in the Targum, והוה לי לפריק. Note that the twelfth chapter of Isaiah is familiar to our Odist (how could it fail to be, since it is so entirely in his manner?), and the opening sentence in the 30th Ode is imitated from it ('Fill ye water for yourselves from the living fountain of the Lord').

v. 3. Both manuscripts have ܬܢܢܐ ܘܕܝܢܐ 'smoke and judgement'. The meaning is very doubtful, and without violent change we are unable to find a better translation. Gunkel changes ܘܕܝܢܐ to ܘܪܝܚܐ 'and smell'.

v. 4. We might probably read ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܡܪܝܐ 'with the Word of the Lord', instead of ܒܡܡܪܐ 'in the rank of the Lord'. The elimination of the letter ܐ is possibly due to a slip of the copyist.

Expository Notes.

This Ode appears to express in poetical language some peculiar spiritual experience. Some of the figures of previous Odes recur; there is the milk of God, and twice, if not three times, there is the dew of

Digitized by Google

the Lord. No adequate explanation has yet been found of the Divine dew. It is a Biblical expression used in the prophet Isaiah to represent the grace that raises the dead; but this is the text of the LXX:

ἡ δρόσος ἡ παρὰ σοῦ ἴαμα αὐτοῖς ἐστιν.—Isaiah xxvi. 19,

and this does not seem to apply to the present situation.

The solution of this Ode cannot be detached from that of the Ode which follows; for here also there is a 'cloud of dew'; here, too, some one speaks of becoming *great according to the greatness of the Lord*, and being anointed from *His perfection*. We shall see that the 36th Ode is probably spoken in the name of Christ; and if so, that should carry the 35th Ode to the same conclusion. But this does not seem to be likely, nor a very defensible position. Evidently there is something missing in the explanation.

We have seen that the Odist has been making word-play out of the assonance of ܐܛܠܠ 'to overshadow', ܛܠܠܐ 'shadow', ܛܠܐ 'dew', and ܛܠܝܐ 'child'. We can probably find a motive for his word-play; 'the cloud of peace' in verse 2 is parallel to the 'cloud of dew' in the next Ode; and the 'dew' is, in fact, alluded to in verse 1 of this Ode. But this 'cloud of dew' is taken from Isaiah xviii. 4:

'As a *cloud of dew* in the heat of harvest,'

where the Peshitta and the Targum supply us with the very expression which is in the Odes to which we refer. Thus the 'cloud of dew' is a *shelter*: now we understand why the Odist says, 'More than *shelter* he was to me'. But this is not all: there is a parallel passage of Isaiah which has been employed by the Odist. At the end of the fourth chapter of Isaiah we have the following statement:

> 'The Lord will create over the whole habitation of Mount Zion and over her assemblies, *a cloud and smoke* by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory shall be spread as a canopy. And there shall be a pavilion for a shadow in the day-time from the heat, and for a refuge, and for a covert from storm and rain.'—Isaiah iv. 5, 6, R. V.

Here we pick up fresh references to the covering from the heat, and we also see the reason for the allusion to the 'smoke' that came forth in verse 3. Suppose, then, we look at this passage of Isaiah in the Syriac

Digitized by Google

version and in the Targum. We shall find the same assonance between the 'dew' and the 'shelter' which the Odist has been developing; and we shall also find the motive for the verse:

> 'More than shelter he was to me,
> And more than foundations.'

> ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ ܛܠܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ
> ܘܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ ܫܬܐܣܬܐ

For the Targum reads:

> 'The Lord shall create over every sanctuary of Mount Zion, and over every place of the House of His Shekinah, *a cloud* of glory (ענן יקר); and it shall be *shadowing* (מטיל) over him by day and thick darkness and glory as of a flame of fire by night; because *more than the glory* which (יתיר מן יקרא) He said He would bring upon Him, the Shekinah shall be *protecting* Him with (its) *protection*: and upon Jerusalem there shall be the *shelter* of clouds to *shelter* over her by day,' &c.

> מטלת ענני לאטללא עלה בימם

It will be seen that the Odist has closely followed the language of Isaiah, imitating even such an expression as 'more than the glory', which is peculiar to the Targum. Here, then, we have a further key to the meaning of the Ode, and a further proof of the dependence of the Odist on the Targum.

ODE XXXVI

1 I rested on the Spirit of the Lord;
And (the Spirit) raised me on high:

2 And made me to stand on my feet in the high place of the Lord;
Before His perfection and His glory;
While I was praising (Him)[1] by the composition of His odes.

[1] *Or*, I was praised in the composition.

Digitized by Google

(Christ speaks)

Cf. John i. 9.

3 (The Spirit) brought me forth before the face of the Lord.
And although a Son of Man,
I was named the Luminary, the Son of God:

Cf. Prov. viii. 31 (Syriac).

4 While I was the most glorified among the glorious ones;[1]
And the greatest among the great ones.

5 For according to the greatness of the Most High, so she[2] made me;
And like His own newness He renewed me:

Koran iii. 40.
Cf. Ode xxi. 7.

6 And He anointed me from His own perfection;
And I became one of those that are near to Him;

7 And my mouth was opened like a cloud of dew;
And my heart gushed out, as it were,[3] a gush of righteousness;

8 And my access (to Him) was in peace:
And I was established in the Spirit of Providence.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 3. In view of uncertainties it is safer to follow the reading of the manuscripts.

v. 5. It would be somewhat more grammatical to read with Grimme ܥܒܕܢܝ and refer the verb to the 'Lord' or 'God'. The manuscripts, however, in using the feminine form have referred it to the 'Spirit' of the Lord in verses 1, 2.

Expository Notes.

In this Ode we have assumed that after the usual preface of the poet who composes the Ode, the speaker is the Lord Christ. In that case, the Holy Spirit is the Mother of Jesus, and we actually find a

[1] H, glorifiers. [2] *Sc.* the Spirit. [3] B, *om.*

Digitized by Google

suggestion to that effect in an early heretical gospel attributed to the Ebionites. Equally doubtful, from an orthodox point of view, is the statement in verse 6 that Christ is one of the Divine neighbours; we have indicated on the margin the reference to the same title which has been preserved in the Ḳur'ān (مِنَ ٱلْمُقَرَّبِينَ), i. e. one of those who are near (to God).

A very slight change in verse 5 will rid us of the obscurity of such a phrase as the Divine newness; read:

'He (*or* she) made me glad with His own gladness';

ܘܐܚܝܢܝ ܒܚܕܘܬܗ ܚܕܘܬܐ

this not only relieves the obscure sentence, but makes sequence with the following line,

'He anointed me,' &c.;

for this is the famous early Christian testimony, 'God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness', which is quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 8) from Psalm xlv. 6, 7. Now this Psalm is an epithalamium composed for King Solomon; so that we have again in the Odes either Solomon himself or Christ as Solomon.

Justin Martyr, discussing this very Psalm, points out to Trypho that the Holy Spirit here calls Christ God as well as Christ, which agrees with what the Odist says in verse 3:

'Though a Son of Man, I was named Son of God.'

The proof was made (1) from the unction, (2) from the address to the anointed one as God. It is one of the oldest arguments from Scripture in the Christian theology.

If this should turn out to be a correct interpretation of the Ode, we shall have to admit that the name of Solomon attached to the Odes is something more than an outside, bookmaker's or bookseller's, label; it must be used in the internal interpretation of the Odes as Odes of Rest, for that is one of the root-meanings of Solomon's name, and he is supposed to have this name as being historically the man of peace. See what is said on this point in the following Ode.

v. 4. Special attention should be paid to this term ܩܪܝܒܐ (in vulgar Syriac ܩܪܝܒܝܢ), for it answers to the Targumic רברבין, which is the

translation of Elohim when that word is taken in the plural and does not mean God.

For instance, in Genesis iii. 5, the serpent assures the woman that, if they eat of the forbidden fruit, they will be like the Great Ones who know good and evil. Such a writer, for instance, as our Odist would never interpret this passage of God Himself, whom he affirms not to know evil; probably this explanation was widely current; and it underlies the substitution of 'the Great Ones' for Elohim. As we have said, the point is an important one, for if it carries the sense of Elohim, for the expression in the Ode it shows that the person who is speaking in the Ode is not an ordinary human being.

v. 6. It would be interesting to determine more exactly the origin of the peculiar expression, 'One of those that are near to Him'. Is it possible that it is the Odist's adaptation of the phrase in Daniel?

> 'One like unto the Son of Man came to the Ancient of Days and *they brought him near before Him.*'—Dan. vii. 13.

Here we may compare the language of the Ode:

ܘܗܘܝܬ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܡܩܪ̈ܒܘܗܝ

with וקדמוהי הקרבוהי

of the prophet, the Syriac version being almost identical with the Hebrew [Chaldee]. There is no reason why we should not recognize the Apocalyptic passage in Daniel as the origin of the language in the Ode; in each case it is the Son of Man who is referred to, for we have identified Christ as the Speaker in this Ode, and it is the Messiah that is the person who is brought near to the Highest in Daniel. Moreover, in this very Ode, the speaker has already denoted himself as

> '*The Son of Man*, the Luminary, the Son of God.'

In this point of view, any suspicion of unorthodox leanings in the expression 'one of those that are near' disappears; the Odist is no more unorthodox than the Book of Daniel which he borrows.

This suggestion throws further light on the language of the Ode as well as on the Book of Daniel and its text. To begin with, we recognize in the Aramaic text of Daniel, which is the only text we possess for the major part of the book, the traces of a true Targum. Here, again, we have the expression 'before God' used as a substitute for 'God'. Instead

Digitized by Google

of 'they brought him near to the Most High', the text says, 'they brought him near before the Most High'. This is genuine Targum which has been substituted for a missing Hebrew text of Daniel in the major part of the book. We may recognize the same tendency in the Ode in verse 3, where the Christ is brought forth ܩܕܡ ܡܢ ܐܦ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܡܪܝܐ, which is a kind of double Targumism and may be itself an imitation of Daniel.

Again we have to recall that it is to this very language of Daniel that we had already referred the expression in Ode xix, where the Virgin 'brought forth, as it were a man', which we interpreted as the equivalent of 'one like to a son of man'.

We have, then, two distinct cases of Apocalyptic in the Odes. It was one of the things we should naturally have expected to find, if the Odes had been rightly assigned to the Eastern Church and to the first century (or even to the beginning of the second century). Here is the elusive factor, almost as clearly recognized as if it had been the Apocalypse of John that we were studying. The Odist tells us plainly that 'Jesus is the Son of Man in the visions of Daniel'. His sources of information are clearly Aramaic or Syriac, and not Greek. There is no possibility of dependence upon a Greek text.

Incidentally we shall raise again the question as to the speaker in Ode xxi. 6, 7, who says:

'I passed before Him and became near unto Him.'

The expression has a Targumist evasion in the words 'before Him' ('from before His face'); but the expression 'became near unto him' may here be called non-Targumic. 'Passed before Him' may be the Odist's imitation of the passage in Daniel which says that the Son of Man

'came (ܡܛܐ) to the Ancient of Days.'

It may be admitted that the suggestion that Ode xxi as well as Ode xxxvi has traces of Daniel is not so convincing as in the case of the latter Ode. So we will leave the matter uncertain in the hope of further and future illumination.

The prophecy of the dominion given to the Son of Man in Daniel, ch. vii, was certainly in the original *Book of Testimonies*: Cyprian has it, and Gregory of Nyssa; and Justin quotes it frequently.

It may perhaps be asked what is the meaning of the title 'the

Digitized by Google

Luminary', interjected between the terms 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God'. We are far away by this time from Dr. Bernard's explanation that it is the baptized person's description of himself: but this does not relieve us of the duty to find a better solution.

We suggest that this also comes from Daniel. In chap. ii. 23 Daniel praises God because He is the revealer of secrets, and because 'He knoweth what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with Him'. A reference to the text shows that the rendering 'the light' (נהורא) has been derived from a reader's correction. No doubt it was a sound correction, but the text says 'the luminary' (נהירא). So does the Syriac version presenting the very same peculiar form that has turned up in our Ode. It is, then, not an unnatural inference that the Odist worked on an uncorrected text of Daniel, and interpreted the 'Luminary' to be the Christ.

ODE XXXVII

1 I stretched out my hands to the Lord;[1]
And to the Most High I lifted my voice;

2 And I spake with the lips of my heart;
And He heard me when my voice reached Him.[2]

Cf. Luke i. 44 (Syriac).

3 His Word came to me,
And[3] gave me the fruits of my labours:

4 And gave me rest by the grace of the Lord.

Hallelujah.

Critical Note.

v. 2. The verb ܢܦܠ of the manuscripts is much better than ܢܦܩ proposed by Bruston (see Luke i. 44).

[1] my Lord (H). [2] *Lit.* fell with him. [3] *Lit.* who.

Digitized by Google

Expository Notes.

At first sight this appears to be a Psalm of the simplest possible character, a brief story of prayer and of the answer to prayer. But there is more in it than appears on the first reading. The stretching out of the hands occurs in the 35th Ode, where we have

'I spread out my hands in the lifting up of my soul,'

and this must be connected in some way with

'I stretched out my hands to the Lord,
And to the Lord I lifted up my voice.'

The variation is in the manner of the Odist, when dealing with a Biblical theme, and may equally happen when he is repeating his own formulae. Then we notice that this Ode is also one of the Odes of Rest, and in the 35th Ode, the sentence before the one just quoted is 'I *rested* in His perfection'. Thus there must be some connexion between the 35th Ode and the 37th. Let us see whether this reference to a 'rest in God' may not give us a clue to the meaning. Imagine that the reference is to Solomon as a man of rest. Then this 37th Ode will refer to Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple. 'The King stood before the altar of God and *spread forth his hands* towards heaven and said' (2 Chron. vi. 12, 14). God's answer to Solomon is in the words, 'the Lord appeared to Solomon by night and said to him, I have heard thy prayer'. The Ode expresses this in the manner of a Targum:

'He heard me when my voice reached Him;
His word came to me.'

and the statement, 'I have chosen this place to myself for an house of sacrifice' would answer to the Odist's 'He gave me the fruit of my labours'.

Thus this Ode might be labelled an Ode of Solomon in a historical sense, without any need to introduce Christ as Solomon.

Supposing we accept this solution for Ode xxxvii, where it will apply very well, can we carry back a Solomonic interpretation into Ode xxxv or xxxvi? We will take the case of Ode xxxvi. Notice that there is a play on Solomon's name in the last verse:

'My access to Him was in peace;'

Digitized by Google

and the last half of the verse:

> 'I was *established* by the spirit of Providence.'

will correspond to 2 Chron. vii. 18:

> 'I will *establish* the throne of thy Kingdom as I covenanted with David thy father.'

There is another great Solomonic Psalm in the Psalter, the 72nd ('Give the king thy judgements, O God'). In this Psalm we are told that 'he shall come down like rain upon the mown grass, as *showers* that water the earth'. Perhaps it is these *showers* ('drops of dew' ܪ̈ܣܝܣܐ in the Syriac Bible) that are responsible for the frequent reference to the 'dew of the Lord' in the Odes.

That the origin of the description of Christ as 'the dew' may, perhaps, be in the Psalm which we have referred to, can be seen from Eusebius, *Theophania*, Bk. I, c. 25:

> 'This is the common Saviour of all (*sc.* the Logos), on whose account this universal essence is productive and rejoices that it ever drinks *from his dewdrops.*'
>
> (ܡܢ ܢܛܦ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܟܠ ܐܝܟ ܡܫܬܝܐ).

ODE XXXVIII

Cf. Ps. xlii. (xliii.) 3. 1 I went up into the Light of Truth as into a chariot:
And the Truth led me and brought me:

2 And carried me across hollows and gulfs,
And from the cliffs and reefs it preserved me;

Cf. Ps. cvii. 30. 3 And became to me a Haven of Salvation;
And set me on the arms[1] of immortal life.

4 And it went with me and made me rest and suffered me not to err;
Because it was and is the Truth;

[1] B, step.

Digitized by Google

5 And I ran no risk because I walked with Him;[1]
And I made no error in anything, because I obeyed Him.

6 For Error fled away from Him:
And would not meet Him:

7 But Truth was proceeding in the right way;
And whatever I did not know He made clear to me:

8 All the drugs of Error and the plagues of death which are considered to be sweet (beverage).

9 And I saw the Destroyer of the Corruptor[2] when the Bride who was being corrupted was adorned,
Along with the Bridegroom who corrupts and is corrupted.

10 And I asked the Truth, Who are these? and He said to me:
This is the Deceiver and the Error:

11 And they imitate the Beloved and His Bride:
And they lead astray and corrupt the world.

12 And they invite many to the Banquet,
And give them to drink of the wine of their intoxication;

13 And they make them vomit up their wisdom and intelligence;
And they deprive them of understanding;

14[a] And then they leave them;
And so these go about like madmen and corrupt;

14[b] Since they are without heart;
And do not seek after it.

[1] *Sc.* the truth.

[2] *Or*, Corruption.

Digitized by Google

15 And I was made wise so as not to fall into the hands of the Deceiver;[1]
And I congratulated myself that the Truth had gone with me;

16 And I was established and lived and was redeemed;
Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 10. And my foundations were laid by the Lord;[2]
Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 6. For He planted me.

17 For He set the root:
Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 6. And watered it and fixed it and blessed it:
And its fruits will be for ever.

18 It struck deep and sprang up and spread wide,
And it was full and was enlarged.

19 And the Lord alone was glorified,
Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 10. In His planting and His husbandry:[3]

20 In His care and in the blessing of His lips;
In the beautiful planting of His right hand.

21 And in the splendour[4] of His planting,
And in the thought of His mind.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. In the text we have punctuated the word ܓܠܠܐ 'waves', but it might be read as ܓܠܠܐ 'valleys', 'ridges', 'reefs', 'ledges', 'cliffs', which gives a sense more in harmony with the rest of the Ode in which land is intended.

As for the word ܠܡܐܢܐ, erroneously translated in the *editio princeps*, it is certain that it must be pointed and translated 'Haven'.

[1] B, Deceivers.
[2] *Lit.* On the hand of the Lord.
[3] *Or*, work.
[4] B and H discovery (*ex errore*).

Digitized by Google

v. 6. There is no need to change with Grimme ܠܗܘ into ܠܗ̇ܘ.

v. 8. Both manuscripts have ܕܚܠܝܘܬܐ 'sweetness'. Not seeing how torments might be considered as sweetness of death we have changed in the text the word into ܕܚܝܠܘܬܐ 'terror' and we have omitted to place in the foot-note the reading of the manuscripts. The former translations in following the order of words as found in the text were somewhat unintelligible: e. g.

> 'All the poisons of error and the plagues which are thought to be the sweetness of death.'

The translation which we have adopted above cannot do the slightest violence to the Syriac grammar, in which we are informed that the two terms of annexion are often separated (*Mingana's Gram.*, No. 420).

In view of the difficulty arising out of the former translations Barth suggested the change of ܘܡܟܐ̈ܒܐ into ܘܡܟܡ̈ܪܐ. The change, apart from being too violent, cannot solve the problem of 'the torments of the sweetness of death'.

If we take ܚܠܝܘܬܐ in the sense of 'juice of fruits, liquor', we may see in it an underlying Greek οἰνόμελι like the corresponding ܚܠܝܐ. This sense would be in harmony with the rest of the Ode which deals with intoxication.

'Plagues of death' may be considered as a Semitism for 'deadly plagues'.

v. 9. The first member of this verse ܘܡܚܒܠܢܗ ܕܚܒܠܐ offers some difficulty; it means evidently 'the destroyer of the corruption', because 'the corruptor of the corruption' has no meaning in itself. The author is, therefore, playing on the two different meanings of the verb 'to destroy' and 'to corrupt'. The idea of destroying corruption is expressed again in Ode xxxiii. 1.

Here also it would perhaps be better to punctuate ܕܡܚܰܒܠܐ 'of the corruptor' to make it conform with ܕܡܚܰܒܠܢܘܬܐ of the end of the verse, and with what we have suggested in our note to Ode xxxiii. 1. Consequently there is no need to change with Grimme the sentence of the manuscripts into ܘܡܚܒܠܢܗ ܚܒܠܐ.

v. 17. ܘܦܐܪ̈ܘܗܝ with *waw* of the manuscripts is better Syriac than ܕܦܐܪ̈ܘܗܝ suggested by Grimme.

Digitized by Google

Expository Notes.

This Ode from its first verse is full of difficulties and obscurities. The Odist ascends a chariot, called the Light of Truth, and the Truth guides him through various dangers, by land and by sea, to a haven of salvation. This Psalm of Truth now becomes a Psalm of Truth and Error; the contrary natures of the two are exhibited, and then, by a sudden personification, Truth and Error acquire human forms, and we have before us what looks like a pair of heretical teachers, whose wiles the Odist considers himself lucky to have escaped. Then the Ode ends with praise for the skilful culture of the great husbandman, whose plant the Odist confesses himself to be.

All of this is very difficult to explain; are we dealing with real experience, or is it allegory? Are they real heretics that are being denounced? One reason for thinking so lies in the fact that Ignatius of Antioch, in dealing with Antiochene and other contemporary heresy, uses language which is similar to that of the Odist: he says that these heretical teachers mingle error with truth, as poisoners or druggists put medicaments into honey-wine. See what has been said on this in the Introduction. Ignatius also calls these heretical teachers mad dogs who bite one unawares; and the Odist also says that they make men mad, and then the victims go about like mad ⌜men⌝ to hurt other people. Possibly the word 'dogs' has dropped from the text of the Ode at this point.

We have discussed elsewhere (see p. 148) the possibility that the chariot in verse 1 may really be a ship, perhaps a misunderstood ὄχημα of a Greek text. This would argue a Greek original for the Ode; but this evidence for Greek originals has been steadily growing less in the course of our study of the collection, and even ὄχημα might require an explanatory word. This particular Ode has a Greek word κίνδυνος transliterated in it, but the word occurs not uncommonly in Syriac writers. It is certainly curious that the word turns up again in the very next Ode!

The only clear references to the Scripture are the allusion to the 43rd Psalm in verse 1:

> 'Send out thy light and thy truth.
> Let them lead me and let them bring me;'

Digitized by Google

and the reference to the 107th Psalm:

'So he bringeth them to the haven where they would be.'

The suggestion was made by Professor Torrey of Yale that the words in the Ode

'*It became to me* a Haven of Salvation,'

were an Aramaic misunderstanding of 'brought me to the Haven'. If this could be established it would make the Scriptural parallel much closer.

If it were not for the fact that antiquity has been established for the Odes, both as regards individual compositions, and as a collection, we should have been tempted to regard this attack on the heretical teachers who make men mad, as a conventional Patristic attack on Mani and his followers the Manichaeans. Thus Eusebius (*Theophania*, Bk. IV, chap. 30) speaks of 'that *madman* of yesterday and of our own times, whose name became the titular badge of the Manichaean heresy'. And Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* vi. 19): 'Thou must hate all heretics, but especially him who even in name is a *maniac*, who arose lately under the emperor Probus.' Eusebius plays on the same note in his History.

However, it is clear from Ignatius that heretics had been classed with mad dogs from a very early time. Mani is only a belated illustration.

ODE XXXIX

1 Mighty rivers are[1] the power of the Lord;
Which carry headlong
Those that despise Him: — Cf. Amos v. 24 (Pesh.).

2 And entangle their paths,
And sweep away their fords:[2]

3 And carry off their bodies
And destroy their souls.

[1] *Or*, (As) mighty rivers is. [2] *Or*, ferries.

Digitized by Google

4 For they are more swift than lightning,[1]
And more rapid:

5 But those who cross them in faith
Shall not be moved;

6 And those who walk on them without blemish
Shall not be afraid.

7 For the sign in them is the Lord;
And the sign becomes the way of those who cross in the name of the Lord.

8 Put on, therefore, the name of the Most High and know Him:
And you shall cross without danger,
While the rivers shall be subject to you.

9 The Lord has bridged them by His word;
And He walked and crossed them on foot;

10 And His footsteps stand (firm) on the waters, and were not erased;
They are as a beam that is firmly fixed.[2]

11 And the waves were lifted up on this side and on that;
And the footsteps of our Lord Messiah stand (firm),

12 And are not obliterated,
And are not defaced.

13 And a way has been appointed for those who cross after Him,
And for those who agree to the course of His faith;
And who adore His name,

Hallelujah.

[1] B, lightnings. [2] *Or*, fixed by Truth.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 1. By an oversight the text has been pointed ܡܣܚܦܝܢ ('They die headlong' or 'upside down'): but H has certainly pointed it ܡܣܚܦܝܢ 'they bring headlong'. We may compare the description of the torrent in Ode vi. 8 which 'carries ⌜away⌝ the temple'. So the meaning of the verse is according to the manuscript, as we have put in the translation 'they carry them (the despisers) headlong.'.

Newbold reads ܚܝ̈ܠܐ for ܚܝܠܗ and translates 'mighty rivers are the powers of the Lord', which is possible.

Expository Notes.

In this Ode the writer speaks the experience of a traveller who is stopped on his way by the sudden rise of a rapid river, which becomes unfordable and is actually unbridged. The Lord, however, is as good as a ford or a bridge: his footprints are as secure to tread in, as if one had a firm beam on which to cross. The Ode is like a little sermon on the text, 'When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee' (Isa. xliii. 2). Or perhaps it is Psalm lxxvii. 19, 'thy way is in the sea and thy paths in deep waters and thy footprints are not known'.

The description of the Lord's walking on the waves reminds one of Galilee, but there are parallel expressions in the Old Testament.

We have suggested on the margin that the text of the Ode is under the influence of Amos v. 24 in the Syriac, the '*mighty* rivers' being parallel to the '*mighty* torrent of righteousness'.

ODE XL

1 As the honey distils from the comb of the bees,
And the milk flows from the woman that loves her children,
So also is my hope on thee, my God.

2 As the fountain gushes out its water,
So my heart gushes out the praise of the Lord,
And my lips utter praises to Him.

Digitized by Google

3 And my tongue is sweet in His intimate converse
And my limbs are made fat by the sweetness of His Odes.

4 And my face is glad with His exultation;
And my spirit exults in His love;
And my soul shines in Him;

5 And the fearful one shall confide in Him;
And redemption shall in Him stand assured;

6 And his gain is immortal life;
And those who participate in it are incorruptible.

Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 5. We have pointed ܕܚܠܐ ('fear confides in Him'), but the facsimile shows the vocalization ܕܚܠܐ 'the fearer', which gives the sense, 'the fearful one confides in Him', as we have translated. Bruston proposes to derive the verb ܡܬܬܟܠ from ܐܟܠ; this, however, is not very probable.

v. 6. ܘܡܘܬܪܗ 'and his gain' refers to ܘܕܚܠܐ of the preceding note. We may possibly read ܘܡܘܪܬܗ 'his inheritance'.

Expository Notes.

This beautiful Ode is altogether experimental: it is made up of milk and honey, of joy and gladness, of thanksgiving and the voice of melody. The writer admits that he is a shining soul; 'my soul shines in Him'.

It is not easy to find an underlying Biblical theme, if indeed one exists. In verse 3 (a missing verse recovered from the Nitrian Codex) is a sentence in which the Odist repeats, with variation, something he had said in the 20th Ode;

'Thou shalt be fat in the praise of His holiness.'

Digitized by Google

Here it is:

'My limbs are fat in the sweetness of His Odes.'

We showed above that in Ode xx there was a Biblical base in the 58th chapter of Isaiah. The same word for 'fat' is again used in the present Ode.

The Ode is also parallel in many of its expressions to the 21st Ode; here also we have the overflowing heart, the praising lips and heart, and the exultant face. The 21st and the 40th Odes might be hung up side by side.

ODE XLI

1 Let all[1] the Lord's bairns praise Him,
And let us[2] appropriate the truth of His faith.

2a And His children shall be acknowledged by Him;

2b Therefore let us sing in His love:

3 We live in the Lord by His grace;
And life we receive in His Messiah.

4 For a great day has shined upon us;
And marvellous is He who hath given us of His glory.

5 Let us, therefore, all of us unite together in the name of the Lord:
And let us honour Him in His goodness:

6 And let our faces shine in His light;
And let our hearts meditate in His love,
By night and by day.

7 Let us exult with the joy of the Lord.

[1] Let us (B). [2] Let them (H).

Digitized by Google

(Christ speaks.)

8 All those that see me will be astonished;
For from another race am I.

Prov. viii. 22 (Heb.). 9 For the Father of Truth remembered me;
He who possessed me from the beginning.

Cf. Prov. viii. 25 (LXX). 10 For his riches begat me,
And the thought of His heart:

(The Odist speaks.)

11 And His Word is with us in all our way,
The Saviour who makes alive and does not reject our souls:

Cf. Philip. ii. 8, 9. 12 The man who was humbled,
And was exalted by His own righteousness;

13 The Son of the Most High appeared
In the perfection of His Father;

14 And light dawned from the Word
Cf. John i. 1. That was beforetime in Him;

15 The Messiah is truly one;
Prov. viii. 23, 29. And He was known before the foundations of the world,
That He might save souls for ever by the truth of His name:

(Doxology.)

16 Let a new song arise to the Lord from them that love Him.
Hallelujah.

Digitized by Google

Critical Notes.

v. 1. We do not feel justified in adopting the readings ܢܣܒܪܘܢ or ܢܘܕܘܢ ('let them announce' or 'let them thank') suggested by Schulthess, for ܘܢܩܒܠܘܢ 'And let them receive'. In the following verse it is intimated that by receiving the truth of His faith the sons of God will be recognized by Him.

v. 4. Strictly speaking the verb ܐܢܗܪ means 'it shone' or '(He) made to shine'. In the first sense the subject would be 'a great day', and in the second 'the Lord'. Cf. xi. 14.

v. 15. Connolly has pointed out that the phrase ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܬܪܡܝܬܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ is used in the New Testament Peshiṭta as a rendering of πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to know the precise epoch of the appearance of the Syriac word ܬܪܡܝܬܐ. Can we assert that the author of the Peshiṭta, an Edessenian, was the first writer who used it? From the fifth century onwards, possibly under the influence of the Peshiṭta, it is constantly found in genuine Syriac writings. We are also unable to say why it is used in the plural and why it is derived from the form *Af'el* of the verb. On the other hand, the expression ܐܪܡܝ ܫܬܐܣܬܐ 'he laid the foundations' of something, is of frequent use among Syrians, and appears to be original, although these same Syrians prefer the use of the verb ܣܡ to ܐܪܡܝ. The lexicographers explain the word as meaning the 'first stages', or 'strata' of the world; hence, they say, is the reason it is used in the plural. In the West Syrian breviary, and in some writers of lower date, ܬܪܡܝܬܐ is simply used to mean 'creation' and is almost synonymous with ܒܪܝܬܐ; the word has even given birth to the expression ܪܫ ܬܪܡܝܬܐ 'the beginning of the creation'. Whether it was the author of the Peshiṭta who derived this word from the author of the Odes, or the Odist from the Peshiṭta, it is difficult to decide, until the history of both is, through other channels, more fully established. It might even be a fortuitous encounter in a commonplace expression employed in Edessa from the first to the fifth century. (Cf. above, pp. 95 and 122.)

Expository Notes.

In this Ode, Christ is the speaker alternately with the poet. At the eighth verse we recognize the familiar strain, 'all that see me will be

astonished'. We must compare the words of Christ in Ode xvii and in Ode xxviii. The origin of the repeated expression is probably Psalm lxx. (lxxi.) 7:

ὡσεὶ τέρας ἐγενήθην τοῖς πολλοῖς.

Ode xvii helps us to understand the next clause; the sentences are parallel.

Ode xvii. 6.	Ode xli. 8.
'All that saw me were amazed: And I was regarded by them as a strange person.'	'All those that see me will be astonished; For from another race am I.'

Thus the stranger (ܐܟܣܢܝܐ) is the same as the person from another race (ܡܢ ܓܢܣܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ). It refers to Christ, and not to the Odist, conceived of as a proselyte of the gate who has joined the Jewish or Judaeo-Christian community. It is the same statement which Christ makes in Ode xxviii that 'I was not their brother, nor my birth like theirs'. It is an intimation of the Miraculous Birth and Origin.

That is the reason why the Odist (verses 9, 15) now reverts to the eighth chapter of Proverbs, and to the Birth of the Divine Wisdom, for Christ is the Wisdom of God.

At the eleventh verse the Odist takes up the reference to the Word of God, and explains that He was truly of one nature with the Father, unique in Himself and one with God, and that he pre-existed before the foundation of the world. The statement that 'the Christ is truly one', is quoted and dilated on by Ignatius in his epistle to the Magnesians, as we have shown in the Introduction.

In the same verse we have a Targumism for 'God is with us in all our way'. Cf. the Targum on Gen. xxxv. 3, where Jacob says: 'His Word . . . was with me for my help in the way that I went.'

There is a Semitic turn of speech in verse 6, 'Let our faces shine by His shining'. In the same verse there is an adaptation of a verse in the first Psalm:

'And in His law he will meditate day and night;'

for which the Odist suggests

'Let our hearts meditate in His love by night and by day.'

Cf. the Syriac of the two sentences:

Digitized by Google

Psalm i. 2. ܘܒܢܡܘܣܗ ܢܗܓܐ ܐܝܡܡܐ ܘܠܠܝܐ
Ode xli. 7. ܘܢܗܓܘܢ ܒܚܘܒܗ ܐܝܡܡܐ ܘܠܠܝܐ

The coincidence is striking between the two texts; and we may possibly be justified in inferring an actual dependence of the Ode upon the *Syriac* Psalm, though the translation is a natural one and the ideas are simple. But it is interesting to note the substitution of Love for Law by the Odist. We had already shown his acquaintance with the first Psalm in our notes on the first Ode. The 41st Ode now reinforces the conclusion.

The Odist never mentions the Law, and here we see that he substitutes for it as well as avoids it. This single consideration is of such weight that we may be sure *he is neither a Jew nor a Jewish proselyte.*

There is a coincidence in the second verse with the Psalter of Solomon, which, perhaps, is more than accidental. In Ps. Sol. xvii. 30 we have:

'For he knoweth them that they are all the children of God;'

and when we compare this with Ode xli: 'All the Lord's children will praise Him. . . . . *And His children shall be known to Him*', we have a close agreement which suggests that the Odist has been using the Psalter of Solomon as he uses the Psalter of David. Or it may be that both writers are working on some unrecognized Old Testament quotation.

ODE XLII

1 I stretched out my hands and approached my Lord;
For the stretching out of my hands is His sign;

2 And my expansion is the outspread wood[1]
That was set up on the way of the Righteous One.

(Christ speaks.)

3 And I became of no use to those who knew me:
For I shall hide myself from those who did not take hold of me:

[1] *Or*, tree.

4 But I will be with those
Who love me.

5 All my persecutors have died;
And they sought after me who proclaimed about me[1];
Because I am alive.

6 And I rose up and am with them;
And I will speak by their mouths.

7[a] For they have despised those who persecute them.

7[b] And I threw over them the yoke of my love:

8 Like the arm of the bridegroom over the bride,
So is my yoke over those that know me.

9 And as the couch that is spread in the chambers of the bridegroom and the bride,
So is my love over those that believe in me.

10 I was not rejected, though I was reckoned to be so;
And I did not perish though they thought it of me.

11 Sheol saw me and was in distress;
Death cast me up and many along with me:

Isa. xiv. 9, and Euseb. *D. E.* (x. 8).

12 I have been gall and bitterness to it,
And I went down with it to the extreme of its depth.

13 And the feet and the head it let go,
For it was[2] not able to endure my face:

[1] *Or*, set their hope on me.

[2] they were (H).

14 And I made a congregation of living men amongst his dead men;
And I spake with them by living lips:
In order that my word may not be void.

15 And those who had died ran towards me;
And they cried and said, Son of God, have pity on us;

16 And do with us according to thy kindness;
And bring us out from the bonds of darkness:

17 And open to us the door
By which we shall come out to thee;
For we perceive that our death does not touch thee.

18 Let us also be saved with thee;
For thou art our Saviour.

19 And I heard their voice,
And I laid up their faith in my heart;

20 And I set my name upon their heads:
For they are free men and they are mine.
Hallelujah.

Critical Notes.

v. 1. For ܘܐܬܩܪܒܬ Gunkel proposes ܘܐܬܩܕܫܬ 'I was sanctified'. This change would not be in harmony with the particle ܠܘܬ which follows the verb: it is also a violent change which does not commend itself, although corroborated by a reference to Ode xxvii. 1. Labourt's opinion that ܐܬܩܪܒܬ means in Syriac 'j'ai sacrifié' is not probable.

v. 2. Gunkel proposes ܘܦܫܛܘܬ 'and the expansion of' instead of ܘܦܫܛܘܬܝ 'my expansion' of the manuscripts, and translates 'und das Ausstrecken des ausgestreckten Holzes, an dem der Aufgerichtete am

Wege hing'. Labourt accepts Gunkel's theory and would have us, therefore, change the text of the second line into what he calls 'corrections excellentes'. These corrections would give us a text

ܘܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܩܝܣܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܕܐܬܬܠܝ ܒܗ ܥܠ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܠܙܕܝܩܐ

'l'extension du bois étendu, où (sic) a été pendu, sur la route, le Juste'. The Syriac so constituted is exceedingly weak, and even faulty. In the parallel Ode xxvii, the word occurs as 'my expansion', and we do not see any obvious reason to depart from the reading of the manuscripts. It is said in the first verse, 'I expanded my hands' (ܦܫܛܬ) and ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ of the second verse is, therefore, a continuation of the same idea. This is common to both Odes. Both Odes also agree to the fact that this 'expansion of hands is the sign' (of the Lord); but instead of ܦܫܛ both use ܡܬܚ, which is almost synonymous with it. Both Odes harmonize in their statement that this 'expansion of hands' is a 'straight' or 'extended' wood; but the word used to express 'straight' or 'extended' is ܦܫܝܛܐ in Ode xlii, and ܕܬܪܝܨ in Ode xxvii. That in Ode xxvii we cannot take ܕܬܪܝܨ as a substantive and translate 'of the Just' is shown by its contracted masculine form, which cannot suffer a modification in its adjectival sense; there is little doubt, therefore, that ܦܫܝܛܐ of Ode xlii refers also to 'wood'. The utmost we could linguistically say is that 'my expansion' is a sign of the 'straight' or 'extended' wood; supposing that the word ܐܬܐ has been omitted, as its repetition may have been considered useless; the text then would have been:

ܡܛܠ ܕܡܬܚܐ ܕܐܝܕܝ ܐܬܐ ܗܘ
ܘܦܫܝܛܘܬܝ ܐܬܐ ܩܝܣܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ

'Because the expansion of my hands is His sign,
and my outstretching is (the sign of) the extended wood.'

Ode xxvii ends here; Ode xlii tells that this 'straight' or 'extended' wood has been 'erected', or 'hung up' in the way of the 'Righteous One'. Here the word is used in its emphatic and not contracted form.

We could, however, take ܕܬܪܝܨܐ as a contracted feminine adjective, referring to ܐܘܪܚܗ 'His way', i. e. the way of the Lord. On this hypothesis the sense would be: 'And my expansion is the extended (or straight) wood, which has been hung up on *His* straight way'. This is the utmost meaning that the Syriac wording can give.

Digitized by Google

The reading adopted by Grimme ܒܒܥܘܗܝ for ܒܥܐ is improbable.

v. 9. Labourt's suggestion that ܒܝܬ ܚܬܢܘܬܐ 'sleeping-room of a newly married couple' should be read ܒܝܬ ܚܬܢܐ 'the house of the bridegroom' is not necessary.

v. 12. Grimme proposes the plausible emendation of ܒܗ into ܒܗ̇, thus referring the pronoun to *Sheol* of verse 11.

Expository Notes.

This closing Ode of the collection describes the Descent of Christ into Hades, and the release of souls there bound and imprisoned. Prefixed to this is a short introduction coinciding closely with the 27th Ode, and this is followed by a meditation of the Risen Christ over His own triumph and a declaration of His love as the Bridegroom towards His bride. We need not suppose that the earlier sentences are an addition, nor remove them as a repetition. The Odist habitually repeats himself; and in the present case we can find the motive for the repetition. The writer is working on the 88th Psalm as a description of the descent into Hades, and in this very Psalm stand the sentences:

> 'I cried unto thee, O Lord, all day long,
> *I spread out my hands.*'

We compare:

Ode xlii. 1. ܦܫܛܬ ܐܝ̈ܕܝ ܘܐܬܩܪܒܬ ܠܘܬ ܡܪܝ

Psalm lxxxvii. (lxxxviii.) 10. ܦܫܛܬ ܐܝ̈ܕܝ ܠܘܬܟ

After this preliminary explanation of his outspread hands, the Odist plunges at once into the Hades theme, in the words

> 'I became of no use to my acquaintance.'

He is working on the sixth verse of the Psalm, which appears in the LXX as:

ἐγενήθην ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀβοήθητος,

with a side-light from verse 9:

ἐμάκρυνας <u>γνωστούς μου</u> ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

The Syriac of the Psalm which answers to ἀβοήθητος is ܕܠܝܬ ܠܗ ܐܝܠܐ:, and the Syriac of the Ode is ܕܠܐ ܚܫܚܐ. The Syriac of the Psalm is nearly a transliteration of the Hebrew: the sentiment is the same. Now we have

Digitized by Google

the key in the lock. The previous clause in the Psalm declares that 'I am reckoned with them that go down into the pit'; this is a theme that frequently recurs in the Odes, where Christ is speaking: it is in the tenth verse of this Ode in the form:

'I was not rejected though *I was reckoned to be so*:
I did not perish though *they thought it* of me.'

The verse in the Psalm (verse 6), which says:

'Thou hast laid me *in the lowest pit*,
In darkness, *in the deep*,'

is responsible for verse 12 of the Ode:

'I went down with him (Sheol) into the *extreme of its depth*.'

With this Psalm the Odist has also used a sentence from Isaiah, describing the descent of the Morning Star into Hades, which says in the English Version:

'Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming,

but which appears in the LXX and in the Syriac as:

'Hades is *embittered* at thy descent,' (πικραίνεται);

which leads the Odist to say:

'I have been *gall and bitterness to him*.'

In the Psalm again the Odist found the words 'Free among the dead', perplexing words which the Early Church interpreted of Christ, and these words are at the back of the Odist's statements:

'A congregation of living men *amongst his dead men*:
They are free men, they are mine.'

We have shown in the Introduction that this Ode is quoted by Eusebius and by Cyril of Jerusalem, and it is also responsible for some sentences in the *Acts of Thomas*. We translate the passage from the Greek and the Syriac for purposes of comparison. One sentence of the Greek *Acts of Thomas* was quoted in the second edition as a possible parallel, viz. the words

οὗ τὴν θέαν οὐκ ἤνεγκαν οἱ τοῦ θανάτου ἄρχοντες,

but the passage is of wider interest:

(Syr.) 'Thou didst descend into Sheol with mighty power, and the dead saw thee and became alive, and *the lord of death was not able*

Digitized by Google

to bear it; and thou didst ascend with great glory, and didst take up with thee all who sought refuge with Thee.' (ܠܡܬܛܫܝܢ.)

(Greek) 'Thou didst descend into Hades with mighty power, thou *whose sight the lords of death could not bear*, and gathering together (συναγαγὼν) all that fled to thee for refuge (τοὺς εἰς σὲ καταφυγόντας) thou didst prepare the way.'

The Syriac depends altogether on the Ode, and the Greek depends on the Syriac; there is one word in the Greek (συναγαγὼν) which may, perhaps, be claimed as an independent loan from the Odes, for in verse 15 Christ speaks of making a '*congregation* of living men among the dead'. Otherwise the Greek is a working over of the Syriac, as the Syriac Acts are of the Odes. 'Those who *sought refuge* with Thee' is derived from 'Those who had died *ran to me*'. Perhaps the Syriac Acts have dropped the word 'gather', and we should read 'Thou didst gather and take up', &c. Evidently the Acts of Thomas have used the 42nd Ode.

Ephrem also has used it freely in his descriptions of the *Descent into Hades* in the *Carmina Nisibena*. See especially for 'Sheol made sad':

> 'The Virgin in her bringing forth He made glad; but Sheol he grieved and made sad (ܐܥܝܩ ܘܐܟܡܪ) in His resurrection.
> Sheol was made sorrowful (ܐܬܥܝܩܬ) when she saw them, even the sorrowful dead, made to rejoice'.—*Carm. Nisib.* 27. 4, 6.

In the *Breviarium Chaldaicum* (ii. p. ܩܐ) we find a similar strain to the language of the Odes:

> 'O Living One, who wentest down to the abode of the dead, and didst announce a good message to the souls who were bound (ܐܣܝܪܝ) in Sheol.'

Similar sentences are found in the *Missale Syr. Orient:* (Mosul, 1901), p. ܟܒ, &c.

Digitized by Google

THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON

PSALM XLIII

Psalms of Solomon I.

(1) I cried unto the Lord when I was in affliction at my end; and to God when sinners set upon me: (2) for suddenly there was heard before me the sound of war: for He will hear me because I am filled with righteousness. (3) And I reckoned in my heart that I was filled with righteousness; in the day that I became rich and was with the multitude of (my) children. (4) Their wealth, however, has been given to the whole earth: and their glory as far as the ends of the earth. (5) And they were lifted high as the stars: and they said (6) that they will not fall, and they were insolent in their good things, and they spake without knowledge. (7) For their sins were in secret and I knew them not: (8) and their wickedness had exceeded that of the nations that had been before them: and they defiled the sanctuary of the Lord with pollution.

PSALM XLIV

Psalms of Solomon II.

(1) In the insolence of the sinful man, he cast down with battering rams[1] the strong walls, and thou didst not restrain him. (2) And the Gentile foreigners went up on thy altar, and were

[1] *Lit.* great beams.

Digitized by Google

trampling on it with their shoes in their insolence. (3) For the children of Jerusalem had polluted the Holy House of the Lord: and they were profaning the offerings to God[1] with wickedness.

(4) Wherefore He said, Remove them, cast them away from me. And He did not establish with them the beauty of His glory; (5) it was rejected before the Lord: and it was utterly torn in pieces. (6) Her sons and her daughters were in bitter captivity, and on their neck was put the sealed yoke of the Gentiles: (7) According to their sins so He dealt with them: for He suffered them to pass into the hand of him that was stronger than they. (8) For He turned away His face from His mercy: young men and old men and their children together; (9) because they also had worked evil together, that they might not hearken unto me. (10) And the heaven was mightily angered, and the earth rejected them: (11) because none in (the earth) had done therein like their doings; (12) and that the earth may know all thy righteous judgements, O God. (13) They set up the sons of Jerusalem for mockery within her, in the place of harlots; and every one that transgressed[2] was transgressing as if before the sun: while they made sport in their villainies as they were used to do. (14) In the face of the sun they made show of their villainies. And the daughters of Jerusalem were polluted according to thy judgements; (15) for they had polluted themselves in lustful intercourse. My belly and my bowels are in pain over these things. (16) But I will justify thee, O Lord, in the uprightness of my heart; because in thy judgements is thy righteousness, O God. (17) For thou dost reward sinful men according to their deeds: and according to their wicked and bitter sins. (18) Thou didst disclose

[1] *Lit.* of God.

[2] *Or*, passed by.

Digitized by Google

their sins, in order that thy judgement might be known. (19) And Thou didst not blot out their remembrance from the earth. God is a judge and righteous, and accepteth no man's person. (20) For the Gentiles reproached Jerusalem in their wickedness, and her beauty was cut off from the throne of His[1] glory. (21) And she was covered with sackcloth instead of beauteous raiment: and there was a rope on her head instead of a crown. (22) She cast off from her the dazzling[2] glory which God had put upon her; (23) and in contempt her beauty was cast away on the ground. (24) And I beheld and I besought the face of the Lord, and I said, Enough! Thou hast made Thy hand heavy, O Lord, upon Israel, by the bringing in of the Gentiles; (25) for they have mocked and not pitied, in anger; (26) and in reproach they are consumed, unless thou, O Lord, shalt restrain them in thy wrath. (27) For it is not in zeal that they did (this), but in the lust of the soul: (28) That they might pour out their wrath upon us in plundering us. But thou, O Lord, delay not to recompense them upon their own heads; (29) to cast[3] down the pride of the dragon to contempt. (30) And I delayed not until the Lord showed me his insolence smitten on the mountains of Egypt: and despised more than him that is least (honoured) on land and sea: (31) and his body coming on the waves in much contempt, and none to bury (him). (32) Because he had rejected Him with scorn, for he did not consider that he is a man. And the end he did not regard. (33) For he said, I will be the Lord of land and sea: and he knew not that the Lord is God, great, mighty, and powerful, (34) and He is King over Heaven and over Earth: and He judges

[1] Greek, her. [2] Greek, 'her diadem of glory'.
[3] Cod. B, 'to speak', in agreement with the corrupt Greek.

Digitized by Google

kingdoms and princes, (35) He who raiseth me up in glory and layeth low[1] the proud for destruction, not for a time but for ever, in contempt; because they knew Him not.

(36) And now behold, ye great ones of the earth, the judgement of the Lord, for He is a righteous King, and judges what is under the whole Heaven. (37) Bless ye the Lord, ye who fear the Lord reverently; for the mercies of the Lord are on them that fear Him with judgement, (38) to separate between the righteous and the sinful, and to reward the sinful for ever according to their deeds—(39) and to be gracious to the righteous after their oppression by sinners: and to reward the sinful for what he has done to the righteous: (40) because the Lord is kind to those that call upon Him in patience, to do according to His mercy to His saints: so as to stand before Him at all times in strength. (41) Blessed is the Lord for ever by His servants.

PSALM XLV

Psalms of Solomon III.

(1) Why sleepest thou, my soul, and dost not bless the Lord? (2) Sing a new song to God and keep vigil in His watch. For a Psalm is good (to sing) to God out of a good heart. (3) The righteous will ever make mention of the Lord: in confession and in righteousness are the judgements of the Lord. (4) The righteous will never neglect[2] when he is chastened by the Lord: because his will is always before the Lord. (5) The righteous stumbles and justifies God: he falls and I wait[3] what the Lord will do to him.

[1] Greek κοιμίζων and so Syriac.
[2] Greek ὀλιγωρήσει: cf. Prov. iii. 11, Heb. xii. 5.
[3] Read, 'and he waits'.

Digitized by Google

(6) And he looks to see from whence his salvation comes. (7) The stability of the righteous is from God their Saviour: for in the house of the righteous there does not lodge sin upon sin; (8) because he always visits the house of the righteous to remove the sins of his transgressions. (9) And he delivers his soul, in whatever he has sinned without knowledge, by fasting and humiliation; (10) and the Lord purifies every holy man and his house. (11) But the sinner stumbleth and curseth his own life, and the day in which he was born: and the birth-pangs of his mother; (12) and he adds sin upon sin to his life: (13) he falls, and because his fall is grievous, he rises not again: for the destruction of the sinner is for ever. (14) And he will not remember Him when He visits the righteous. (15) This is the portion of sinners for ever. (16) But those who fear the Lord shall rise to eternal life: and their life shall be in the light of the Lord, and (their life) shall not fail any more. (Hallelujah).[1]

PSALM XLVI (XLVII)

Psalms of Solomon IV.

(1) Why sittest thou, O wicked man, in the congregation of the righteous, and thy heart is far removed from God; and by thy wickedness thou provokest to anger the God of Israel, (2) exceedingly by thy words and exceedingly by thy outward signs more than all men? He who is severe in his words in his condemnation of sinners in judgement, (3) and his hand is the first to be on him, as though (he acted) in zeal: and he is guilty himself of all kinds

[1] This is an addition by the scribe under the influence of the Odes of Solomon which he has been copying.

Digitized by Google

of sinful crimes. (4) His eyes are on every woman immodestly and his tongue lies when he answers with oaths. (5) In the night and in the darkness as if he were not seen; by his eyes he talketh with every woman in the cunning of wickedness: (6) and he is quick to go into every house with joy as if he had no wickedness. (7) God shall move those who judge with respect of persons: but He lives with the upright, in the corruption of his body and in the poverty of his life. (8) God will disclose the deeds of those who are men-pleasers: in scorn and derision are his works. (9) And let the saints justify the judgement of their God, when the wicked shall be removed from before the righteous. (10) The accepter of persons who talks law with guile, (11) and his eyes are on a house, quietly like a serpent, to dispel the wisdom of each one by words of villainy: (12) his words are with an evil intent, with a view to the working of the lust of wickedness: (13) and he does not remove until he has scattered in bereavement, and has desolated the house because of his sinful lust: (14) and he supposes in his words that there is none that sees and judges: (15) and he is filled with this sinfulness; and his eyes are on another house to devastate it with words of prodigality; and his soul is, like Sheol, never satisfied. (16) For all these things, let his portion' O Lord, be before thee in dishonour; let his going out be with groans and his coming in with curses: (17) in pains, and in poverty, and in destitution, O Lord, let his life be: let his sleep be in anguish, and his waking in vexation: (18) let sleep be removed from his eyelids by night: let him fall from every work of his hands in dishonour, (19) and let him enter his house empty-handed, and let his house be destitute of everything that can satisfy his soul: (20) and from his offspring let not one draw near unto

Digitized by Google

him: (21) let the flesh of the hypocrites be scattered by wild beasts: and the bones of the wicked (lie) before the sun in dishonour: (22) let the raven pick out the eyes of those who are men-pleasers. (23) Because they have laid waste many houses of men in dishonour: and have scattered them in lust: (24) and they remembered not God; nor feared God in all these things; (25) and they provoked God, and He was angered to destroy them from the earth: because with crafty intent they had played the hypocrite with innocent souls. (26) Blessed are they that fear the Lord in their innocency: (27) and the Lord will save them from all the cunning and wicked men; and he will redeem us from every stumbling-block of the wicked. (28) God has destroyed all them that work fraud with pride,[1] for a strong judge is the Lord our God in righteousness. (29) Let thy mercy, O Lord, be upon all them that love thee.

PSALM XLVII (XLVIII)

Psalms of Solomon V.

(1) O Lord my God, I will praise thy name with exultation, amongst those that know thy righteous judgements. (2) For thou art gracious and merciful, and the place of refuge of the poor. (3) When I cry unto thee, be not thou silent unto me. (4) For one does not take spoil from the strong man. (5) Or who will take aught from what thou hast made unless thou give it to him? (6) Because he is man, and his portion is before thee in the balance: and he shall not add aught to better it apart from thy judgement, O God. (7) In our afflictions, we call thee to our help: and thou hast not turned away our petition: for thou art our

[1] *Lit.* excess.

Digitized by Google

God. (8) Delay not thou thy hand from us lest we be strengthened to sin: (9) and turn not away thy face from us, lest we remove away from thee: and to thee we will come: (10) for if I should be hungry, O Lord, unto thee will I cry, O God: and thou wilt bestow. (11) For the fowl and the fish thou dost feed. When thou givest rain in the desert to cause the grass to spring up, (12) to prepare food in the wilderness for every living thing, and if they shall be hungry, unto thee will they lift up their faces: (13) kings and rulers and peoples thou dost provide for, O God: and the hope of the poor and the miserable, who is it except thyself, O Lord? (14) And thou wilt answer him because thou art kind and gentle: and his soul shall be satisfied when thou openest thy hand in mercy: (15) for the kindness of a man is with parsimony, to-day and to-morrow; and if it should be that he repeats his gift and does not grumble, he is wonderful. (16) But thy bounty is plenteous in kindness and in wealth; and there is no expectation towards thee that He will be sparing in gifts.[1] (17) For over all the earth is thy mercy, O Lord, in kindness. (18) Blessed is the man whom the Lord shall remember in poverty: for that a man should exceed his measure (means that) he will sin. (19) Sufficient is a low estate with righteousness[2] (20) For those that fear the Lord are pleased with good things: and thy grace is on Israel in thy kingdom. (21) Blessed be the glory of the Lord, for He is our King.

[1] The Greek has been misread.

[2] The Syriac has omitted a sentence of the Greek by a common transcriptional error. Add: 'And herein is the blessing of the Lord, that a man be satisfied in righteousness'.

Digitized by Google

PSALM XLVIII (XLIX)

Psalms of Solomon VI.

(1) Blessed is the man whose heart is prepared to call upon the name of the Lord: (2) and when he shall remember the name of the Lord, he will be saved. (3) His ways are directed from before the Lord: and the works of his hands are preserved by his God. (4) And 'in' the evil vision of the night his soul shall not be moved: because he is His: (5) and his soul shall not be affrighted in the passing through the rivers and in the tumult of the seas. (6) For he rose from his sleep and praised the name of the Lord: (7) and in the quietness of his heart he praised the name of the Lord and he made request from the face of the Lord concerning all his house. (8) And the Lord hears the prayer of every one that is in His fear, and every petition of the soul that trusts in Him; and the Lord fulfils it. (9) Blessed is He who doeth mercy upon them that love Him in truth.

PSALM XLIX (L)

Psalms of Solomon VII.

(1) Remove not thy tabernacle from us, O God, lest those rise up against us who hated us without a cause: (2) for thou hast put them away, O God, that their foot may not tread the inheritance of thy sanctuary. (3) Thou in thy good pleasure chasten me, and deliver us not over to the Gentiles. (4) For if thou shouldest send death, it is thou who givest it command against us: (5) for thou art the merciful one, and wilt not be angry so as to consume us utterly. (6) For because of thy name that encamps amongst us, mercies shall be upon us: and the Gentiles shall not be able to prevail against us. (7) For thou art our strength: we will call upon thee and thou wilt answer us: (8) for thou wilt be gracious

Digitized by Google

to the seed of Israel for ever, and thou wilt not forget him.[1] (9) Establish us in the time of thy help to show favour to the house of Jacob in the day that is prepared for them.

PSALM L (LI)

Psalms of Solomon VIII.

(1) Distress and the sound of war mine ears have heard, the sound of the trumpet and the noise of slaughter and destruction: (2) the sound of much people like a mighty and frequent wind: like the tempest of fire which comes[2] over the wilderness. (3) And I said to my heart: Where will [God] judge him? (4) And I heard a sound in Jerusalem the Holy City. (5) The bonds of my loins were loosed at the report[3] (6) and my knees trembled and my bones were moved like flax. (7) And I said, they will make straight paths in righteousness, and I remembered the judgements of the Lord, from the creation of the heaven and the earth: and I justified God in all his judgements from the beginning.[4] (8) But God lay bare their sins before the sun: and to all the earth were known the righteous judgements of the Lord. (9) For in the secret places of the earth were they doing evil; (10) the son had connexion with the mother and the father with the daughters: (11) and all of them committed adultery with their neighbours' wives: and they made them solemn covenants among themselves concerning these things: (12) they were plundering the Holy House of God, as if there were none to inherit and to deliver. (13) And they were treading His sanctuary in all their pollutions,

[1] The Syriac has dropped the sentence: 'And we are under thy yoke for ever, and under the scourge of thy chastening'.

[2] The second *Alaph* in the text should be *Taw*.

[3] Greek adds: 'and my heart was afraid'.

[4] *Lit.* from eternity.

Digitized by Google

and in the time[1] of their separation they polluted the sacrifices, as common meat: (14) and they left no sins which they did not commit, and even worse than the Gentiles. (15) For this cause God mingled for them a spirit of error, and caused them to drink an unmixed cup[2] of drunkenness: (16) He brought him from the other side of the world, the one that afflicts grievously: (17) and he decrees war against Jerusalem and against her land: (18) and the judges of the land met him with joy: and they said to him: Thy path shall be ordered, come, enter in peace. (19) They levelled the rough paths[3] for his entering: they opened the doors against Jerusalem: and they crowned her walls. (20) And he entered like a father into the house of his children in peace: and he set his feet 'there' in great firmness: (21) and they took possession of the towers and walls of Jerusalem. (22) For God brought him in assurance against their error. (23) And they destroyed their princes, because he was cunning in counsel: and they poured out the blood of the dwellers in Jerusalem like the water of uncleanness: (24) and he carried off their sons and their daughters, who had been (born) in pollution, (25) and had wrought their pollution even as also their fathers had done. (26) And Jerusalem defiled even those things that were consecrated to the name of God: (27) and God was justified in his judgements upon the nations of the earth, (28) and the saints of God were as innocent lambs in their midst. (29) God is to be praised who judges all the earth in His righteousness. (30) Behold, O God, thou hast shown us 'thy judgement'[4] in thy righteousness, (31) and our eyes have seen thy judgements, O God; and we have justified thy name that is honoured for ever.[5]

[1] *Lit.* blood. [2] *Lit.* a living cup (i.e. a cup of strong wine).
[3] *Lit.* paths of salvation. [4] Cod. *om.*
[5] Correct the punctuation of the first word.

Digitized by Google

(32) For thou art a God of righteousness: who judgest Israel with chastening. (33) Turn thy mercy towards us and be gracious to us: (34) and gather the dispersion of Israel, in mercy and in kindness: (35) for thy faithfulness is with us: and we are stiff-necked and thou art our chastener: (36) do not desert us, O our God! lest the Gentiles should swallow us up, as though there were none to deliver: (37) and thou art our God from the beginning, and upon thee is our hope, O Lord: (38) and we will not depart from thee, for thy judgements are good; (39) and upon us and upon our children is thy good will for ever, O Lord God, Our Saviour, and we will not be shaken again for ever. (40) The Lord is to be praised for His judgements by the mouth of His saints: (41) and blessed is Israel from the Lord for evermore.

PSALM LI (LII)

Psalms of Solomon IX.

(1) When Israel went forth into captivity to a strange land, because they departed from the Lord their Saviour: (2) then were they cast out from the inheritance that God gave them: amongst all the Gentiles was the dispersion of Israel according to the word of God, (3) that thou mightest be justified, O God, in thy righteousness over our wickedness: (4) for thou art a just judge over all the peoples of the earth. (5) For there will not be hidden from thy knowledge any one who doeth wickedness: (6) and the righteousness of thy upright ones, O Lord, is before thee. And where shall a man be hidden from thy knowledge, O God? (7) For we work by freewill and the choice of our own souls to do either

Digitized by Google

good or evil by the work of our hands: (8) and in thy righteousness thou dost visit the children of men. (9) For he who does righteousness lays up a treasure of life with the Lord: and he who does wickedness incurs judgement upon his soul in perdition.

(10) For His judgements are in righteousness upon every man and his house. (11) For with whom will the Lord deal graciously unless with them that call upon the Lord? (12) For he purifies the sins of the soul by confession, (13) because shame is on us and our faces because of all these things. (14) For to whom will He remit sins except to those that have sinned? (15) For the righteous thou dost bless, and dost not reprove them for any of their sins; for thy grace is on those that have sinned when they have repented. (16) And now, thou art our God, and we are thy people whom thou hast loved: behold, and have mercy, O God of Israel; for thine we are: remove not thy compassions from us, lest the Gentiles should set upon us; (17) for thou hast chosen the seed of Abraham rather than all the Gentiles, (18) and thou hast put on us thy Name, O Lord: and thou wilt not remove for ever. (19) Thou didst surely covenant with our Fathers concerning us; and we hope in thee in the repentance of our souls. (20) The mercies over the house of Israel are of the Lord now and evermore.

PSALM LII (LIII)

Psalms of Solomou X.

(1) Blessed is the man whom God remembered with reproof: and He has restrained from him the way of evil by stripes: so as to be purified from his sin, that it may not abound. (2) For he who prepares his loins for beating shall also be purified:

Digitized by Google

for He is good to those that receive chastening. (3) For the way of the righteous is straight, and chastisement does not turn it aside. (4) For the face[1] of the Lord is upon them that love Him in truth, and the Lord will remember His servants in mercy. (5) For the testimony is in the law of the everlasting covenant; the testimony of the Lord is in the ways of the children of men, by 'His' visitations. (6) Righteous and upright is our God in all His judgements, and Israel will praise the Name of the Lord with joy. (7) And the saints shall give thanks in the congregation of the People: and on the poor the Lord will have mercy in the gladness of Israel. (8) For the Lord is kind and merciful for ever: and the congregations of Israel shall praise the Name of the Lord. (9) For of the Lord is the salvation upon the house of Israel, unto the everlasting kingdom.[2]

PSALM LIII (LIV)

Psalms of Solomon XI.

(1) Blow ye 'the trumpet' in Zion, the well-known trumpet of the saints: (2) proclaim in Jerusalem the voice of the heralds, because God is merciful to Israel in His visitation. (3) Stand up on high[3] Jerusalem, and behold thy children, who are all being gathered from the east and the west by the Lord: (4) and from the north they come to the joy of their God: and from the far-away islands God gathered them. (5) Lofty mountains has He humbled and made plain before them: and the hills fled away before their entrance: (6) the cedars[4] He caused to shelter them as they passed

[1] Greek, mercy.
[2] Greek, everlasting gladness (εὐφροσύνη).
[3] Baruch v. 5–8.
[4] Greek, the groves.

Digitized by Google

by: and every tree of sweet odour God made to breathe[1] upon them: (7) in order that Israel might pass by in the visitation of the glory of their God. (8) O Jerusalem, put on the garments of thy glory; and make ready thy robe of holiness. For God has spoken good things to Israel now and ever. (9) May the Lord do what He hath spoken concerning Israel: and concerning Jerusalem: may the Lord raise up Israel in the name of His glory. May the mercies of the Lord be upon Israel now and evermore.

PSALM LIV (LV)

Psalms of Solomon XII.

(1) O Lord, save my soul from the perverse and wicked man, and from the whispering and transgressing tongue, that spake lies and deceit. (2) For in the (cunning) response of his words is the tongue of the transgressor[2] of the law: for he shows like one whose deeds are fair, and kindles fire among the people. (3) For his sojourning is to fill[3] (set fire to) houses by his lying talk: cutting down the trees of his delight with the flame of his tongue[4] that does lawlessly. (4) He has destroyed the houses of the transgressors by war: and the slandering[5] lips God has removed from the innocent, the lips of the transgressors: and the bones of the slanderer shall be scattered far from those who fear the Lord. (5) By flaming fire will be destroyed the slanderous tongue from

[1] Greek 'caused to rise'. Corr. the *Yodh* of the Syriac note to *Nun*.
[2] The Greek of this passage is obscure.
[3] The translator reads ἐμπλῆσαι for ἐμπρῆσαι.
[4] Cod. *om.*
[5] *Lit.* whispering.

Digitized by Google

among the upright, and their houses. (6) And the Lord shall preserve[1] the soul of the righteous which hateth them that are evil; and the Lord shall establish the man that makes peace in the house of the Lord. (7) Of the Lord is salvation upon Israel his servant for ever: (8) and the sinners shall perish together from before the face of the Lord: and the saints of the Lord shall inherit the promises of the Lord.

PSALM LV (LVI)

Psalms of Solomon XIII.

(1) The right hand of the Lord has covered us: the right hand of the Lord has spared us: (2) and the arm of the Lord has saved me from the spear that goes through and through, and from famine, and the pestilence of sinners. (3) Evil beasts ran upon them: and with their teeth were tearing their flesh; and with their jaw-teeth[2] were breaking their bones. But us the Lord has delivered from all these things. (4) But the wicked man was troubled on account of his transgressions: lest he should be broken along with the evil men. (5) Because dread is the fall of the wicked: but the righteous not one of these things shall touch. (6) For one cannot compare the chastening of the righteous who have (sinned) ignorantly with the overthrow of evil men who (sin) knowingly. (7) For the righteous is chastened[3] so that the sinner will not exult over him. (8) For the Righteous One will admonish him as His beloved son;

[1] Better 'and may the Lord preserve', as in Greek, and so in the following verses.

[2] *Or*, molars: rendering the Greek μύλαις literally.

[3] Or perhaps: 'for the righteous is chastened secretly' (*see* Ryle and James, *ad loc.*).

Digitized by Google

and his chastening is like that of the first-born: (9) for the Righteous One will spare His saints, and their transgressions He will blot out by (His) chastisements. For the life of the righteous is for ever. (10) But sinners shall be cast into perdition: and their memorial shall no more be found. (11) But upon the saints shall be the mercy of the Lord. He will cherish all them that fear Him.

PSALM LVI (LVII)

Psalms of Solomon XIV.

(1) The Lord is faithful to them that love Him in truth: even to them that abide His chastening: to them who walk in righteousness in His commandments: He has given us the law for our life: (2) and the saints of the Lord shall live thereby for ever. The Paradise of the Lord are the trees of life which are His saints: (3) and the planting of them is sure for ever; nor shall they be rooted up all the days of the heaven. For the portion of the Lord and His inheritance is Israel. (4) Not so are the sinners and evil men, those who have loved a day in the participation of sin: for in the brevity of wickedness is their lust; (5) and they did not remember God; that the ways of the children of men are open before Him continually: and the secrets[1] of the heart He knoweth before they come to pass: (6) therefore their inheritance is Sheol and Perdition and Darkness: and in the day of mercy upon the righteous they shall not be found. (7) For the saints of the Lord shall inherit life in delight.

[1] *Lit.* secret places.

Digitized by Google

PSALM LVII (LVIII)

Psalms of Solomon XV.

(1) In my affliction I called on the name of the Lord, and for my help I called on the God of Jacob: and I was delivered. (2) Because thou, O God, art the hope and refuge of the poor. (3) For who that is strong will praise thee in truth? (4) And what is the strength of a man except that he should praise thy name? (5) A new song with the voice in the delight of the heart: the fruit of the lips with the instrument attuned to the tongue: the firstfruits of the lips from a heart that is holy and just. (6) No one that doeth these things shall ever be moved by evil: the flame of fire and the anger of sinners shall not touch them, (7) when it goeth forth against the sinners from before the Most High to root up all the roots of sinners: (8) because the sign of the Lord is upon the righteous for their salvation: death and the spear and famine shall remove from the righteous; (9) for they shall flee from them as death flees from life: but they shall pursue after the wicked and catch them: and those who do evil shall not escape from the judgement of the Lord: for they will get before them like skilled warriors: (10) for the sign of destruction is upon their faces, (11) and the inheritance of sinners is Perdition and Darkness: and their iniquity shall pursue them down to the lower hell. (12) And their inheritance shall not be found by their children: (13) for their sins shall lay waste the houses of sinners: and sinners shall perish for ever in the day of the Lord's judgement, (14) When God shall visit the earth in His judgement. (15) And upon those who fear the Lord there shall be mercy therein; and they shall live in the compassion of our God: and sinners shall perish unto eternity.[1]

[1] *Lit.* the time of eternity.

Digitized by Google

PSALM LVIII (LIX)

Psalms of Solomon XVI.

(1) When my soul declined a little from the Lord, I had almost been in the lapses of the sleep of destruction; and when I was far away from the Lord, (2) my soul had almost been poured out to death, hard by the gates of Sheol along with the sinners: (3) and when my soul separated from the God of Israel, unless the Lord had helped me by His mercy which is for ever! (4) He pricked me, like the spur of the horse, according to His watchfulness: my Saviour and Helper at all times is He: He saved me. (5) I will praise thee, O God, because thou hast helped me with thy salvation: and hast not reckoned me with sinners for destruction. (6) Withdraw not thy mercy from me, O God: and let not the remembrance of thee remove from my heart until I die: (7) save me, O God, from the wicked and sinful woman [1] and from every wicked woman who sets traps for the simple: (8) and let not the beauty of a wicked woman cause me to slip, nor any sin that is, (9) and establish the work of my hands before thee: and preserve my walk in the remembrance of thee. (10) My tongue and my lips in words of truth do thou establish; anger and unreasonable passion, (11) grumbling and little-mindedness in affliction do thou remove from me: for if I shall sin when thou hast chastened me, it is for repentance: (12) but by the good will of joy establish my soul: and when thou shalt strengthen my soul whatever has been given shall be sufficient for me: (13) for if thou strengthenest me not, who can endure thy chastening in poverty? (14) For

[1] Cod. from wicked sin (as in Greek).

Digitized by Google

a soul shall be reproved[1] in his flesh and by the affliction of his poverty: (15) and when a righteous man shall endure these things, mercy shall be upon him from the Lord.

PSALM LIX (LX)

Psalms of Solomon XVII.

(1) O Lord, thou art our King, now and for ever: for in thee, O God, our soul shall glory. (2) And what is the life of man upon earth? For according to his time, so also is his hope. (3) But we hope on God our Saviour: for the empire of our God is for ever according to mercy: (4) and the kingdom of our God is over the Gentiles for ever with judgement. (5) Thou, O Lord, didst choose David for king over Israel: and thou didst swear to him concerning his seed, that their kingdom should not be removed from before thee. (6) But for our sins sinners rose up against us: and they set upon us and removed me far away: those to whom thou gavest no command have taken by violence, (7) and have not glorified thy honourable Name with praises: and they have set up a kingdom instead of that which was their pride. (8) They laid waste the throne of David in the exultation of their change.[2] But thou wilt overthrow them and wilt remove their seed from the earth: (9) even when there shall rise up against them a man that was a stranger to our race. (10) According to their sins thou wilt reward them, O God: and it shall befall them according to their works. (11) And thou wilt not have mercy upon them, O God. Uproot their seed, and do not leave a single one of them. (12) The Lord is faithful in all His judgements which He has

[1] *Or* (*see note to text*), thou wilt reprove.

[2] *Reading* ἀλλάγματος.

Digitized by Google

done upon the earth. (13) The wicked man has devastated our land, so that there is none to dwell therein. They have destroyed both young and old and their children together. (14) In the splendour of his wrath he sent them away to the West, and the princes of the land to mockery without sparing. (15) In his foreign way the enemy exults, and his heart is alien from our God. (16) And Jerusalem did all things according as the Gentiles did in their cities to their gods. (17) And the children of the Covenant took hold of them in the midst of the mingled Gentiles: and there was none amongst them that did mercy and truth in Jerusalem. (18) They that love the assemblies of the saints fled away from them: and they fled like sparrows who fly from their nests: (19) and they were wandering in the wilderness, in order to save their souls from evil: and precious in their eyes was the sojourning with them of any soul that was saved from them. (20) Over all the earth they were scattered by the wicked. Therefore were the heavens restrained that they should not send down rain upon the earth, (21) and the everlasting fountains were restrained, both (from) the abysses, and from the lofty mountains: because there was none among them who did righteousness and judgement: from their ruler to the lowest of them they were in every sin. (22) The king was in transgression and the judge in provocation of wrath, and the people in sin. (23) Behold, O Lord, and raise up to them their King, the Son of David, according to the time which thou seest, O God: and let Him reign over Israel thy servant, (24) and strengthen him with power that He may humble the sinful rulers: (25) and may purify Jerusalem from the Gentiles who trample her down to destruction, (26) so as to destroy the wicked from thy inheritance: and to break their pride like the potter's vessel: to break with

Digitized by Google

a rod of iron all their firmness: (27) to destroy the sinful Gentiles with the word of His mouth: at His rebuke the Gentiles shall flee from before His face: and to reprimand sinners by the word of their heart: (28) that He may gather together a holy people who shall exult in righteousness: and may judge the tribes of the people whom the Lord His God sanctifies: (29) and He shall not any more suffer sin to lodge among them; and no more shall dwell amongst them the man that knoweth evil. (30) For He knoweth them that they are all the children of God, and He shall divide them according to their tribes upon the earth: (31) and the sojourner and the foreigner shall not dwell with them: for He will judge the Gentiles and the peoples in the wisdom of His righteousness: (32) and He shall possess a people from among the Gentiles: that it may serve Him under His yoke: and may praise the Lord openly over all the earth: (33) and He shall purify Jerusalem in holiness, as it was of old time: (34) that the Gentiles may come from the ends of the earth to behold His glory: bringing gifts to her sons who were scattered from her, (35) and to see the glory of the Lord, wherewith He hath glorified her: and He, the righteous King, taught of God, is over them: (36) and there is no wicked person in His days amongst them, because they are all righteous and their King is the Lord Messiah: (37) for He will not trust on horse nor on his rider; nor on the bow: nor shall He multiply to himself gold and silver for war: nor shall He rely on a multitude in the day of war: (38) for the Lord is His King: His hope and His strength are in the hope of God, and He will have compassion (over all . . .) (39) for He will smite the earth with the word of His mouth for ever: (40) and He will bless the people of the Lord in . . . and delight (41) and

Digitized by Google

He is pure . . . the head of a great people, to (confute) the rulers and to destroy sinners by His word: (42) and He shall not be weakened in His days from His God: because (God hath made Him powerful by His Holy Spirit) and wise in the counsel of the prudent with strength and righteousness. (43) and with the blessing of the Lord in Him, and (He shall not be weak). (His hope) is on his Lord and who shall stand against Him? (44) For He is strengthened in His deeds, and is mighty in the fear of His God: (45) feeding the flock of the Lord in righteousness and in faith; and He will not suffer that any one . . . in His pasturage: (46) He will gather them with equality: and pride shall not be found in them that it should rule over them. (47) This is the beauty of the King of Israel . . . to raise him up over the house of Israel, to chasten him. (48) His words are more choice than gold, and they are precious in the synagogues to distinguish . . . from a holy people. (49) His words are like the words of the saints among a holy people: (50) blessed are they who are in those days to see the good men of Israel in the congregation of the people (which God will make), (51) to hasten His mercies upon Israel, and to redeem us from the pollutions of the filthy Gentiles: for the Lord is our King for ever.

Digitized by Google

PSALM LX

Psalms of Solomon XVIII.

(1) O Lord, thy mercy is upon the work of thy hands for ever: (2) and thy grace with a rich gift upon Israel. (3) Thine eyes behold everything and there is nothing hid from them. And thine ears hear the hope of .... Thy judgements are upon all the earth in mercy: and thy love is upon the seed of Israel the son of Abraham. (Thy chastisement is) upon us as upon an only first-born son: to turn away the soul .... which is not instructed and not .... (May God purify) Israel for the day in blessing for His mercy....

Caetera desunt.

A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON IN SYRIAC

The first six verses of the third Psalm are quoted on the margin of a manuscript of the *Hymns of Severus*, and it has been suggested that they represent a different translation of the Psalm from that which occurs in our two manuscripts. The quotation is as follows (see *Hymns of Severus*, ed. Brooks, *Patr. Or.* vii. 726, 727):

[ܕܫܠܝܡܘܢ]. ܠܡܢܐ ܕܡܟܐ ܐܢܬ ܢܦܫ ܘܠܐ ܡܒܪܟܐ ܐܢܬ ܠܡܪܝܐ.
ܠܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܙܡܪܝ. ܘܐܬܬܥܝܪܝ ܒܚܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ. ܡܛܠ ܕܛܒ ܗܘ ܡܙܡܘܪܐ
ܠܐܠܗܐ ܡܢ ܠܒܐ ܛܒܐ: ܙܕܝܩܐ ܠܥ..ܘܢ ܠܡܪܝܐ ܒܟܠܙܒܢ. ܘܡܘܕܝܬܐ ܘ..ܕܘ.ܐ
ܕܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ. ܠܐ ܬܒܣܪ ܢܦܫܗ ܕܙܕܝܩܐ ܡܢ ܡܪܕܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܐ ܨܒܝܢܗ ܒܟܠܙܒܢ ܩܕܡ

ܡܪܝܐ ܗܘ. ܐܬܬܣܝܒ ܕܝܢܐ ܘܕܝܢ ܠܡܪܝܐ. ܢܣܒ ܘܡܠܐ . . ܐ ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܠܗܘ ܐܠܗܐ
ܕܐܦ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܢܣܒܐ ܦܘܪܥܢܐ. ܘܠܘܬ ܡܪܢ

Here then we have, as the variations from our text show, either a revision of that text, or, more probably, as Prof. Nau suggests, an independent rendering of the Greek. As the next quotation is from the *Wisdom of Solomon*, and is introduced by the formula 'Again from the same' (fem.), it is probable that the extract from the Psalms of Solomon was incorrectly referred to the Wisdom of Solomon.

CONCORDANCE TO THE ODES OF SOLOMON[1]

ܐܕܪ 5, 5.
ܐܒܐ 7, 7, 11; 8, 23; 9, 5; 10, 4; 14, 1; 19, 2, 4; 23, 18, 22; 31, 5; 41, 9, 13.
ܐܒ̈ܗܘܬܐ (ܐܒ̈ܗܝܢ) 31, 13.
ܐܒܕ 5, 14; 9, 7; 24, 7, 9; 28, 16; 31, 2; 33, 9; 42, 10.
ܐܘܒܕ 6, 3; 22, 5; 24, 10; 28, 18; 33, 2.
ܐܒ̈ܕܢܐ 28, 9.
ܐܒܕܢܐ 28, 5; 33, 2, 8.
ܐܒܪܐ 25, 5.
ܐܓܪܬܐ 23, 5, 7, 10, 17, 21.
ܐܕܢܐ 16, 9.
ܐܕܢ̈ܐ 9, 1; 15, 4.
ܐܘ 8, 19; 26, 8, 9, 10.
ܐܙܠ 7, 18; 8, 21; 15, 6; 17, 5, 11; 23, 10; 28, 13; 38, 4, 7, 15.
ܐܚܐ 28, 16.
ܐܚܕ 4, 8; 5, 6; 6, 15; 7, 16; 17, 8, 10; 18, 7; 28, 15; 42, 3.
ܐܚܝܕܟܘܠ 8, 21.
ܐܚ̈ܪܢܐ 17, 11.
ܐܚܪܝܬܐ 6, 4; 11, 4.
ܐܚܪܢܐ 4, 1; 41, 8.

ܐܝܟ 4, 14; 5, 12; 6, 1; 7, 1, 6 (bis), 23 (bis); 11, 12, 13, 22; 12, 2, 5, 7; 14, 1, 9; 15, 7 (bis); 17, 6; 18, 11 (bis), 12; 19, 10; 20, 3 (thrice); 23, 5, 6; 24, 5; 25, 5; 26, 13; 28, 1, 9, 13; 29, 2 (bis), 3 (bis), 10; 31, 11; 33, 4; 35, 5; 36, 5 (bis), 7 (bis in H); 38, 1; 39, 10; 40, 1, 2; 42, 8, 9, 16.
ܐܝܟ ܕ (causative) 18, 2; 22, 4; 24, 9; 31, 10; 33, 1.
ܐܝܟܐ 23, 10.
ܐܝܟܐ ܕ 3, 5; 11, 5, 16; 34, 1, 3.
ܐܝܟܢܐ 13, 2.
ܐܝܠܢܐ 20, 7.
ܐܝܠ̈ܢܐ 11, 19, 21.
ܐܝܢܐ ܕ (34 times).
ܐܝܬ 7, 3, 11, 17; 8, 18, 20; 9, 4 (bis), 8; 11, 18; 12, 5, 7, 9; 13, 2; 14, 1; 16, 4; 17, 10; 18, 8; 19, 2; 20, 1; 21, 4 (H); 26, 13; 28, 7; 33, 11; 36, 3; 39, 10; 40, 6; 42, 6, 20.

[1] We have taken no account of suffixes with substantives and transitive verbs, but the plural form of substantives and the primitive and derived forms of verbs have been noted. The pronouns ܗܘ, ܗܝ, ܗܘ̇, ܗ̇ܝ, in their singular form, the relative ܕ, and the auxiliary verb ܗܘܐ have been omitted. Present and past participles when declined are frequently included in the root of the verb when that root is expressed.

ܠܐ ܐܝܬ or ܠܝܬ 3, 6; 4. 2, 11; 11, 23; 16, 18; 17, 3; 18, 8; 21, 4 (B); 24, 9; 34, 1, 3, 5 (bis); 38, 14b.
ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ 12, 9; 16, 18; 17, 10; 23, 9. 12; 24, 7, 8; 31, 8; 38, 4; 42, 12.
ܐܝܟܢܐ 7, 4 (bis); 28, 16 (H).
ܐܝܡܟܐ ? 15, 1; 16, 1.
ܐܝܡܢܐ 10, 5; 23, 17; 41, 5.
ܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ 24, 6.
ܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ 17, 6.
ܐܡܝܢܐ 16, 1.
ܐܠܐ 3, 4; 4, 9; 11, 8; 12, 6; 18, 8, 10 (H); 31, 11; 33, 5, 12; 34, 5; 39, 10.
ܐܠܐ ܐܢ 23, 1, 2, 3.
ܐܠܗ 3, 3.
ܐܠܗܐ 4, 14; 9, 5; 10, 4; 11, 24; 16, 17; 23, 21; 33. 10; 36, 3; 42, 15.
ܐܠܗܝܢ 4, 1; 11, 9; 17, 1; 18, 8; 25, 1; 40, 1.
ܐܠܗ̈ܐ 16, 1.
ܐܠܦ 20, 5 (bis).
ܐܬܐܠܦ 31, 6.
ܐܘܠܦܢܐ 21, 4.
ܐܡܐ 19, 7; 28, 2; 35, 5.
ܐܡܬܐ 29, 11.
ܐܘܡܢܘܬܐ 16, 2.
ܐܘܡܢܘ̈ܬܐ 6, 9.
ܐܡܪ 8, 9; 11, 18; 33, 5; 38, 10; 42, 15.
ܐܢ 5, 13, 14; 23, 1, 2, 3.
ܐܢܐ (43 times).
ܐܢܫ 3, 2; 5, 5; 6, 18; 7, 12 (bis); 8, 15 (bis); 12, 10; 14, 1; 17, 11, 13; 19, 5; 22, 4, 8 (bis); 33, 13; 38, 10; 39, 4, 9 (bis); 42, 20.
ܐܢܫ 4, 13; 6, 15; 13, 1; 16, 2; 39, 11.
ܐܢ̄ܬ 4, 1; 17, 11.
ܐܢܬ (9 times).
ܐܢܬܬܐ 40, 1.
ܐܣܐ 17, 11 (bis).
ܐܣܝܐ 17, 11 (H).
ܐܣܘܬܐ 21, 2; 22, 4; 25, 1; 42, 16.
ܐܦ 3, 5. 8; 9, 2; 12, 5; 16, 1; 18, 12; 28, 3 (B); 29, 2; 40, 1, 4 (B); 42, 15.
ܐܦ ܠܐ 6, 9; 8, 9; 12, 6; 18, 5, 6, 9, 10; 20, 3 (bis), 6 (bis); 21, 4 (bis); 28, 4b, 16; 33, 9; 34, 1, 2; 38, 14; 39, 12.
ܐܦܐ 42, 10 (bis).
ܐܦ̈ܐ 6, 10; 8, 14; 11, 13; 13, 2, 3; 15, 2; 16, 16; 17, 4; 21, 6, 9; 36, 3; 40, 4 (H); 41, 6.
ܐܕ̈ܪܐ 8, 10.
ܐܘܪܚܐ 7, 2, 13; 11, 3 (bis); 12, 6; 17, 8; 22, 7, 11; 23, 15; 24. 13; 34, 1; 38, 7; 39, 7, 13; 41, 11; 42, 2.
ܐܘܪܚܬܐ 3, 10; 33, 7, 8, 13.
ܐܘܪܡ 7, 13.
ܐܪܥܐ 6, 10, 11; 7, 20; 11, 12, 13, 18, 21; 15, 10; 16, 10, 16; 33, 3.
ܐܪܟ 38, 6.

Digitized by Google

ܠܘܦܠܐ 7, 17.
ܐܬܐ 23, 12; 27, 2 (H); 29, 7; 39, 7 (bis); 42, 1.
ܐܬܐ 5, 4; 6, 10; 7, 21; 10, 3; 18, 12; 20, 7; 23, 11, 16; 30, 2, 6; 33, 6; 37, 3.
ܐܬܠ 6, 8; 7, 13; 8, 2; 16, 16; 22, 11; 38, 1; 39, 1.
ܡܬܠܬܐ 6, 17; 7, 17.
ܐܬܪܐ 4, 1 (bis); 11, 18, 23; 18, 7; 22, 6; 34, 2.
ܐܬܪܘܬܐ 4, 2; 23, 17.

ܒܗ (20 times).
ܒܗ̇ 8, 11.
ܒܗܘ̇ 8, 22 (bis).
ܒܗܝ̇ 24, 7.
ܒܗܘܢ (9 times).
ܒܝ (9 times).
ܒܘܙ 14, 7; 22, 7.
ܒܗܝܢ 33, 8, 10.
ܒܗܠܐ 14, 5; 22, 7; 33, 4.
ܒܗܠܬ 5, 9.
ܒܗܝܠܘܬܐ 11, 21.
ܒܗܬܬܐ 18, 7.
ܒܙ 12, 10.
ܒܙܙ 10, 5; 22, 3.
ܒܙܘ 8, 17; 9, 7; 29, 1.
ܒܙܬܐ 31, 9.
ܒܛܠ 4, 4; 16, 13; 23, 19 (B); 42, 14.
ܐܬܒܛܠ 15, 9; 23, 19 (H).
ܒܛܠܐ 11, 23.
ܒܛܝܠܐ 19, 6.
ܒܝܬ 22, 12; 42, 8.
ܐܬܒܝܬ 28, 9.

ܒܝܠܐ 22, 12.
ܐܬܒܝܫ 11, 14; 20, 8; 28, 2.
ܒܝܫܐ 11, 15; 30, 4.
ܒܝܫܘܬܐ 7, 3; 11, 21; 14, 3; 17, 7; 19, 1, 11; 20, 9; 25, 12; 42, 16.
ܒܝܫܬܐ 11, 16, 24.
ܒܟܐ 39, 1.
ܒܟܝܐ 8, 9; 20, 3.
ܒܟܝܬܐ 20, 3.
ܒܠܐ 7, 10; 8, 22; 15, 1; 19, 9; 20, 6; 24, 5; 26, 13; 28, 17, 18; 33, 13; 38, 14; 42, 5.
ܐܬܒܠܝ 19, 3.
ܒܠܘܬܐ 17, 12.
ܒܠܒܠܐ 29, 10.
ܒܠܒܠܬܐ 22, 3; 29, 5.
ܒܠܒܠ ܕܝܬܐ (B ܒܠܒܠܝܬܐ) 22, 3.
ܒܠܥ 16, 8.
ܒܠܥܬܐ 4, 3.
ܒܠܩ 16, 18.
ܒܪܐ (s.) 3, 7 (bis); 7, 15; 14, 1; 19, 2, 7; 23, 18, 22; 29, 11; 36, 3; 41, 13; 42, 15.
ܒܢܝܐ 31, 4; 40, 1; 41, 2; 42, 20.
ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ 12, 12; 36, 3.
ܒܢܝ̈ ܐܢܫܐ 3, 10: 6, 9; 33, 6.
ܒܢܬܐ 33, 6.
ܒܪܐ (v.) 7, 8, 9.
ܒܪܝܬܐ 7, 24; 16, 12.
ܒܪܝܬܐ 4, 7; 16, 13.
ܒܣܡ 22, 6 (H); 28, 4 (bis); 38, 17.
ܒܣܝܡܘܬܐ 17, 14; 38, 20.
ܒܣܪܐ 39, 4.
ܒܥܠܘܬܐ 19, 6, 7; 33, 5.

Digitized by Google

ܢܛܪ 17, 5; 23, 10; 28, 18; 39, 13.
ܢܛܪ ܪܘܚܐ 39, 1.

ܣܒܐ 22, 8.
ܣܒ̈ܐ 4, 8; 8, 20; 23, 2, 3; 33, 13.
ܣܒܟ 8, 20.
ܣܒܪܐ 19, 10; 41, 12.
ܣܒ̈ܪܐ 29, 8.
ܣܓܝܐܐ 23, 11, 13, 16.
ܣܓܸܡ 17, 9.
ܣܓܕ 19, 6.
ܣܘܡ 28, 17 (H).
ܣܘܪ 11, 2.
ܐܬܣܝܪ 11, 1.
ܣܘܪܢܘܬܐ 11, 3.
ܣܚܦ 18, 14.
ܣܝܡ (64 times).
ܣܟܠ̈ܐ 31, 11; 39, 11.
ܣܟܠ̈ܐ 38, 2.
ܣܠܐ 4, 12, 14; 11, 2.
ܐܣܬܠܩ 23, 17; 34, 6.
ܣܡܡܢܐ 33, 5.
ܣܡܝܐ 42, 9.
ܣܡܟܐ 41, 8.
ܣܡܟܐ 16, 2; 36, 7; 40, 2 (bis).
ܣܡܟܬܐ 36, 7.
ܣܒܐ 26, 4.
ܣܦ̈ܩܐ 24, 4; 28, 1 (bis).
ܣܦܪܐ 16, 1.
ܣܪܐ 23, 6.
ܣܪܒܐ 26, 6.
ܣܪ̈ܒܐ 22, 9.
ܣܪܒ 6, 8.
ܣܪܩ 39, 9.
ܥܒܕܬܐ 7, 10.
ܥܒܕ 17, 5; 29, 7; 38, 1.
ܥܒܕܢܐ 14, 4.
ܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ 23, 12; 36, 8.
ܥܒܕܪܬܐ 30, 4; 40, 1.
ܥܒܕܐ 4, 10; 30, 4; 40, 1.
ܥܒܝܬ 16, 18.
ܥܒܝܕܘܬܐ 3, 10; 18, 6, 8.
ܥܒܪ 20, 9; 40, 30 (B).
ܐܬܥܒܪ 42, 11.
ܥܕܝܐ or ܥܕ̈ܝܐ 33, 11; 35, 3.
ܥܕ 28, 2 (bis); 40, 4; 41, 7.
ܥܕܡܐ 8, 1; 21, 9; 23, 4; 40, 4; 41, 7.
ܥܕܡ 5, 10, 11; 23, 8; 24, 3; 25, 11.
ܥܕܬܐ 40, 5.
ܥܠܡܐ 7, 12; 12, 4; 26, 1, 2, 5, 6, 7.
ܥܠܡܝܢ 24, 6.
ܥܠ 8, 14, 16 (bis), 18, 20 (bis); 17, 9, 12, 14; 25, 2; 28, 10; 42, 20.
ܥܠܝ 11, 21 (bis), 22.
ܥܡ (23 times).
ܥܡܘܬܐ 20, 4.
ܐܬܥܡܪ 41, 9.
ܥܡܘܪܐ 11, 22; 28, 17, 18.
ܐܬܥܡܠ 39, 6.
ܥܡܐ (s.) 20, 6.
ܥܡ̈ܐ 9, 9.
ܐܬܥܡܕ 38, 11.
ܥܡܘܬܐ 7, 4; 17, 4; 18, 12; 34, 4.
ܐܬܥܡܪ 28, 8; 41, 8.
ܐܥܡܪܬܐ 26, 11.
ܥܢܐ 21, 8; 41, 14.
ܥܢܝܐ 12, 7.

Digitized by Google

ܡܕܢܚܐ 26, 5.
ܕܪܟ 6, 11; 23, 20.
ܕܪܓܐ 38, 3 (B).
ܕܘܪܓܐ 42, 8.
ܕܘܪ̈ܓܐ 21, 1; 38, 3 (H).

ܗܐ 11, 20; 13, 1.
ܐܬܗܢ 41, 6.
ܗܕܐ 3, 10; 7, 2.
ܗܕ̈ܡܐ 3, 2; 6, 2, 16; 8, 16; 17, 15; 18, 2; 21, 4; 26, 4; 40, 3 (B).
ܗܕܝܡ 38, 14.
ܗܝܟܠܐ 6, 8.
ܗܝܡܢ 22, 7; 28, 3; 29, 6; 34, 6; 42, 9.
ܐܬܗܝܡܢ 6, 13.
ܡܗܝܡܢܐ 28, 3.
ܡܗܝܡ̈ܢܐ 4, 3; 11, 22; 15, 10.
ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ 4, 5; 8, 11; 16, 4; 39, 5, 13; 41, 1; 42, 19 (B).
ܗܟܢ 6, 13; 8, 19; 39, 8; 41, 5.
ܗܟܢܐ 6, 2, 4; 7, 1; 12, 5, 7; 14, 1, 9; 16, 1; 28, 1; 29, 2; 31, 5; 36, 5; 40, 1, 2; 42, 8, 9.
ܗܠܠܘܝܐ at the end of every Ode.
ܗܠܢ 6, 6; 38, 10.
ܗܠܟ 6, 1; 7, 14; 10, 6; 17, 4; 18, 14; 20, 9; 23, 4; 33, 13; 38, 5; 39, 6, 9.
ܗܠܟܬܐ 12, 5; 31, 2.
ܗܠ̈ܟܬܐ 17, 8; 39, 2.
ܗܢܐ 7, 10; 12, 13; 16, 3; 28, 3; 33, 7; 41, 2.
ܗܦܟ 38, 10.

ܗܢܘܢ 4, 3; 6, 9, 13; 8, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 22; 9, 7; 11, 18; 12, 8; 19, 5; 20, 3; 23, 10; 24, 11, 14; 28, 13; 31, 4, 6, 13; 33, 12, 13; 38, 8; 39, 5, 6, 7, 13; 42, 3 (bis; B thrice), 5, 15.
ܗܢܝܢ 18, 12, 15; 23, 1, 2, 3; 38, 14.
ܗܢܝܡ 24, 5.
ܗܦܟ 5, 7; 7, 6; 11, 21.
ܐܬܗܦܟ 8, 14; 11, 21.

ܘܐܡ 8, 3; see ܟܠ ܐܡ.
ܐܙܗܪ 29, 5.
ܐܙܕܗܪ 17, 2; 25, 12; 31, 5.
ܙܗܝܪܘܬܐ 8, 5, 21; 9, 10; 20, 4; 25, 10; 36, 7; 41, 12.
ܙܢ 7, 5.
ܐܙܢ 23, 13.
ܐܬܬܙܝܢ 5, 12; 22, 10; 24, 3; 31, 10; 35, 3; 39, 5.
ܙܘܥܬܐ 31, 11.
ܙܘܥܠܐ 32, 3.
ܙܘܐ 9, 11.
ܐܙܕܘܦ 18, 6.
ܙܟܘܬܐ 9, 12; 18, 7; 29, 9.
ܙܟ̈ܝܐ 15, 2.
ܙܡܪ 7, 17; 16, 3; 24, 1; 41, 2.
ܙܡ̄ܪ 7, 22 (bis).
ܙܡܪܬܐ 26, 2.
ܙܡܝܪ̈ܬܐ 14, 7; 26, 3, 8; 36, 2; 40, 3.
ܡܙܡܘܪܐ 16, 1.
ܡܙܡܘܪ̈ܐ 7, 17, 22.
ܡܙܡܪܢܐ 26, 12.
ܐܙܡܪ 7, 3.
ܐܙܕܡܢ 12, 10.

ܙܪܥ 17, 13.
ܙܪܥܐ 22, 5; 31, 13.

ܐܬܚܒ 3, 2, 5; 19, 11; 41, 16; 42, 4.
ܚܒܝܒܐ 8, 22; 31, 11.
ܚܒܝ̈ܒܐ 8, 22.
ܚܘܒܐ 6, 2; 7, 19; 8, 1, 13; 11, 2; 12, 12; 14, 6; 16, 2, 3; 17, 12; 18, 1; 23, 3; 40, 4; 41, 2, 6; 42, 7, 9.
ܚܒܠ 19, 7; 22, 7; 24, 8; 28, 14; 33, 2; 38, 9 (B bis), 11, 14; 39, 3.
ܐܬܚܒܠ 7, 21; 15, 9; 31, 1; 33, 9; 38, 9 (H bis); 39, 10, 12.
ܚܒܠܐ 15, 8; 22, 11; 33, 1, 7; 38, 9.
ܚܒܠܐ Cf. 33, 1, 7; 38, 9.
ܚܒܠܐ ܠܐ or ܕܠܐ 7, 11; 8, 23; 9, 4; 11, 12; 15, 8; 17, 2; 21, 5; 22, 11; 28, 5; 33, 12; 40, 6.
ܡܚܒܠܢܐ 38, 9.
ܚܘܒܠܐ 24, 8.
ܚܕ 12, 8 (bis), 9 (bis); 16, 17; 28, 9; 36, 6; 41, 14.
ܚܕܐ 4, 5.
ܒܚܕܘܪ 23, 1; 38, 19.
ܚܕܝ 41, 3 (B).
ܚܕܝ 38, 15.
ܚܕܘܬܐ 7, 1, 2, 17; 15, 1 (bis); 23, 1; 31, 3, 6; 32, 1.
ܚܕܪ 28, 13.
ܚܕܬ 11, 11; 36, 5.
ܐܬܚܕܬ 22, 11.
ܚܕܬܬܐ 17, 4; 33, 12.
ܚܕ̈ܬܬܐ 31, 3; 41, 16.
ܚܘܪܬܐ 36, 5.
ܚܘܝ 7, 25; 8, 9; 12, 2; 19, 11; 24, 13; 29, 7; 38, 7.
ܬܚܘܝܬܐ 19, 10.
ܚܙܐ 5, 4, 6; 7, 5, 19; 9, 12; 13, 1; 15, 3; 16, 9; 17, 6; 23, 10; 25, 3 (H); 28, 8; 38, 9; 41, 8; 42, 11, 17.
ܐܬܚܙܝ 5, 14; 7, 12, 18; 11, 1; 16, 8; 17, 10; 18, 11; 23, 18; 25, 3 (B); 28, 9; 29, 6; 30, 6; 33, 4; 41, 13.
ܚܙܘܐ 31, 1.
ܚܙܬܐ 7, 18.
ܡܚܙܝܬܐ 13, 1.
ܚܛܦ 23, 7; 39, 3.
ܚܘܛܪܐ 29, 8.
ܚܝܐ (v.) 5, 3; 6, 18; 8, 16, 22; 17, 14; 34, 6; 38, 16; cf. 41, 3 (H).
ܚܝܐ (a.) 3, 9; 11, 7; 17, 1; 28, 7 (H); 30, 1; 41, 3 (H); 42, 5, 14.
ܚ̈ܝܐ (s.) 3, 9; 6, 18; 8, 2; 9, 4 (bis); 10, 2, 6; 15, 10; 22, 10; 24, 8; 26, 9; 28, 6, 7 (B); 31, 7; 38, 3; 40, 6; 41, 3; 42, 14.
ܚܝܒ 31, 8.
ܐܬܚܝ̈ܒ 31, 9.
ܡܚܝܒܐ 7, 3; 31, 8.
ܚܝܠ 16, 4.
ܐܬܚܝܠ 9, 5; 10, 4.
ܚܝܠܐ 6, 17; 8, 18; 18, 2; 23, 9; 29, 9; 32, 3; 39, 1.
ܚ̈ܝܠܘܬܐ 4, 8; 16, 14.
ܚܝܠܬܢܐ 25, 10.

ܚܟܝܡܘܬܐ 7, 25; 29, 8.
ܚܟ̈ܡ 33, 8.
ܐܬܚܟܡ 3, 11; 5, 7; 38, 15.
ܚܟܝܡܐ 7, 8.
ܚܟܡܬܐ 7, 8; 24, 11; 28, 19.
ܚܟ̈ܡܬܐ 38, 13.
ܚ̈ܠܐ 42, 13.
ܚܠܒ 19, 2.
ܐܬܚܠܒ 19, 2.
ܚܠܒܐ 4, 10; 8, 16; 19, 1, 3, 4; 35, 5; 40, 1.
ܚܘܠܛܢܐ 19, 5.
ܚܠܝܐ 40, 3 (B).
ܚܠܝܘܬܐ 19, 1; 28, 15; 38, 8. (Cf. translation.)
ܚܘܠܝܐ 24, 4.
ܚܠܦ 4, 1 (bis); 17, 13; 28, 14.
ܐܬܚܠܦ 4, 3.
ܚܡܬܐ 7, 1.
ܚܡܨ 23, 14.
ܚܡܪܐ 38, 12.
ܚܢ 7, 5, 10; 42, 15.
ܚܢܢܐ 7, 10; 21, 1, 2.
ܚ̈ܢܢ (pr.) 4, 9; 24, 18.
ܚܢ̈ܩܐ 17, 4.
ܚܣܝܐ 25, 10.
ܚܣ̈ܝܐ 9, 6.
ܚܣܝܘܬܐ 20, 9; 24, 14.
ܚܣܝܢܐ 3, 6; 7, 3; 11, 6; 15, 6; 17, 12; 20, 7; 23, 4.
ܚܣܪ 24, 11.
ܐܚܣܪ 20, 6.
ܚܣܝܪܐ 4, 9 (bis); 18, 4; 24, 9.
ܚܘܣܪܢܐ 15, 10.
ܚܦܝ 23, 13.

ܚܐܪܐ 42, 20.
ܚܐܪܘܬܐ 10, 3.
ܚܪܬܐ 4, 12; 7, 14; 14, 4; 26, 7.
ܚܪܒܐ 28, 4[b].
ܚܪܡܐ 39, 4.
ܚܪܫܘܬܐ 12, 5.
ܚܪܝܦܐ 7, 23.
ܚ̈ܫܐ 21, 4.
ܐܬܚܫܒ 5, 8; 9, 3; 18, 13.
ܡܚܫܒܬܐ 9, 3; 12, 4, 7; 15, 5; 16, 8, 9, 19; 17, 5; 20, 2, 3; 21, 5; 23, 5, 19; 24, 7; 34, 2; 41, 10.
ܡܚܫ̈ܒܬܐ 8, 18; 18, 13; 24, 10; 29, 8; 34, 1.
ܚܫܘܟܘܬܐ 42, 3.
ܚܫ̈ܟܬܐ 14, 10.
ܐܚܫܟ 5, 5.
ܚܫܘܟܐ 11, 19; 15, 2; 16, 15, 16; 18, 6; 21, 3; 31, 1; 42, 16.
ܚܬܡܐ 4, 7; 23, 8, 9.
ܚܬܢܐ 38, 9; 42, 8.
ܒܢܝ ܚܬ̈ܢܐ 42, 9.

ܛܒ 8, 15; 24, 7; 31, 2.
ܐܬܛܒ 7, 20.
ܛܘܒܐ 24, 7.
ܛܒ̈ܥ 8, 16.
ܐܬܛܒܥ 8, 7.
ܛܒܥܐ 10, 3; 11, 20.
ܛܒܥܬܐ 28, 12.
ܛܒܘܬܐ 20, 9 (B); 25, 4 (B); 29, 2 (H); 41, 5.
ܛܝܒܘܬܐ 4, 6; 5, 3; 6, 6; 7, 22, 25; 9, 5; 11, 1; 15, 8; 20, 7, 9 (H); 23, 2, 4; 24, 13; 25,

4 (H); 29, 2 (B), 5; 31, 3, 7; 33, 1, 10; 34, 6; 37, 4; 41, 3.
ܬܘܒܗܘܢ 6, 13; 9, 8; 11, 18; 12, 13; 30, 7.
ܬܘܕܝܬܐ 32, 1; 33, 11.
ܬܠܐ 11, 14; 35, 4 (H ?), 5; 36, 7.
ܬܠܠܐ 35, 4 (H ?).
ܬܠܝܐ 35, 5.
ܐܬܬܠܡ 4, 6; 33, 12.
ܬܠܡܘܣܐ 28, 10.
ܐܬܬܡܗܐ 10, 5.
ܬܡܢ 23, 14.
ܬܡ 6, 6.
ܬܢܝܢܐ 7, 20; 28, 11.
ܐܬܬܢܝܚ 18, 13.
ܬܩܠܐ 17, 5; 28, 15 (B); 31, 2; 38, 4, 5.
ܐܬܬܩܢ 38, 11.
ܡܬܩܢܢܐ 38, 10, 15.
ܬܩܢܘܬܐ 15, 6; 18, 10, 14; 31, 2; 38, 6, 8, 10.
ܬܩܡ 28, 15 (H).
ܐܬܬܩܡ 35, 5.
ܐܬܬܩܦ 42, 3 (B).

ܬܠܬܐ 38, 20.
ܬܠܬܘܬܐ 7, 23; 12, 4; 15, 7; 16, 5, 17; 18, 16; 29, 3.
ܐܘܚܕ 11, 16.
ܡܚܫܒܐ 6, 14.
ܐܬܪܐ 6, 1 (?); 22, 7; 38, 16.
ܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ 16, 6; 23, 7; 27, 1, 2; 35, 7; 37, 1; 42, 1 (bis).
ܬܐܪܐ 12, 11; 15, 5.
ܬܐܪ̈ܬܐ 17, 4; 22, 5; 26, 3; 31, 4; 33, 11; 38, 15.
ܬܡܢ 12, 13; 15, 8; 18, 1; 31, 7.
ܬܘܪܝ 5, 1; 7, 25; 10, 5; 21, 7.
ܐܬܬܘܪܝ 4, 11; 31, 13.
ܡܬܘܪ̈ܢܐ 12, 4.
ܬܘܪܢܬܐ 26, 6.
ܬܘܪܘܬܐ 31, 13.
ܬܪܝܢ 3, 3, 10, 11; 4, 7 (bis); 7, 9; 8, 9, 12 (bis), 14; 9, 7; 12, 6, 10, 13; 16, 13; 17, 7; 18, 9 (bis), 10 (bis), 13 (bis); 19, 5; 23, 4 (B), 10; 24, 14; 26, 12; 30, 6; 38, 7; 39, 8; 42, 3 (B), 8.
ܐܘܪܝܢ 7, 3; 33, 13.
ܐܬܬܪܝܢ 6, 6; 7, 16; 15, 10; 41, 2, 15.
ܐܬܬܘܪܝܢ 6, 18; 7, 12; 12, 13; 24, 14; 28, 16 (B).
ܬܪܥܬܐ 6, 6; 7, 7 (bis), 13, 21; 8, 8, 12; 11, 4; 12, 3; 15, 5; 17, 12; 23, 4 (bis); 34, 5.
ܬܪܥܬܐ or ܕܠܐ 7, 21, 23; 11, 8; 18, 11; 28, 13.
ܡܬܪܥܐ 8, 20; 17, 7; 38, 21.
ܡܬܪ̈ܥܐ 38, 13.
ܬܘܒ 4, 3, 9, 13 (bis); 6, 7, 17; 7, 10, 12, 24; 9, 2, 10; 10, 2; 15, 7; 17, 8, 12; 19, 5; 22, 4, 10; 29, 2, 8; 31, 2 (H), 5; 35, 5; 37, 3, 4; 38, 12; 41, 4.
ܬܫܥ 9, 2; 14, 9.
ܡܬܫܥ 14, 9; 24, 9.
ܐܬܬܫܝܩ 6, 6, 12; 15, 10; 24, 6; 30, 6.
ܡܬܘܡܝܘܬܐ 11, 9; 15. 7; 35, 6.

Digitized by Google

ܡܫܚܐ 7, 23; 15, 1, 3; 16, 16; 41, 4.
ܡܫ̈ܘܚܬܐ 4, 5.
ܡܫܠܐ 24, 1.
ܡܫ̈ܬܐ 28, 1.
ܡܫܟܢ 19, 6, 7, 10 (bis), ; 24, 5; 36, 3; 41, 10.
ܡܫܟܢܘܬܐ 28, 16.
ܡܫܟ̈ܢܘܬܐ 41, 1.
ܡܫܟ 7, 6; 13, 2.
ܐܫܟܚ 3, 10; 14, 7.
ܡܫܢܐ 16, 10; 18, 11.
ܐܡܫܡܫܢܐ 41, 6b.
ܡܫܡܫܢܐ 8, 6, 20; 14, 4; 18, 7; 19, 5; 22, 7; 25, 2, 7, 9; 28, 15; 38, 20.
ܠܡܫܡܫܢܐ 26, 6.
ܡܫܠܐ 11, 1, 19.
ܡܫܘܚܬܐ 11, 19.
ܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ 38, 20.
ܡܫܢ 41, 5.
ܐܡܫܢܐ 16, 20; 20, 10.
ܡܫܢܐ 9, 9.
ܡܫܬ 21, 9.
ܐܘܫܬ 29, 11.
ܡܫܐ 23, 19; 31, 7, 12.
ܐܘܫܛ 14, 4.
ܐܘܫܠ 16, 10.
ܬܘܬܠܐ 24, 3.
ܐܫܬܠ 18, 1.
ܡܬܬܐ 40, 6.
ܡܬܢܬܘ 35, 4 (bis).
ܡܬܢܬܐ 21, 5.
ܡܫܬܐ 4, 5; 23, 9; 28, 19.
ܬܐܒ 19, 7.
ܬܐܪܐ 21, 4.
ܬܐܘܬܐ 9, 9; 22, 12; 31, 11.
ܬܒ 5, 9; 7, 5, 9; 17, 10, 11; 19, 5; 21, 4, 7; 30, 6; 31, 8, 9; 36, 2, 3, 4; 37, 2; 38, 9, 14 (bis); 39, 8.
ܬܘܒ 20, 1.
ܬܘܒܐ 20, 1.
ܬܘܒܬܐ 16, 11.
ܬܒܐ 7, 6.
ܬܒܢܬܐ 30, 4; 40, 1.
ܬܚܝܬ 4, 5, 15; 6, 10, 11; 7, 13; 11, 20; 14, 8, 10; 15, 2, 10; 16, 18; 17, 6, 7, 11; 18, 7 (bis); 22, 6; 23, 13, 17; 24, 4; 26, 4 (bis); 28, 19; 30, 2; 33, 2, 4; 34, 3; 35, 3; 38, 8; 41, 1, 5, 11.
ܬܚܝܬ ܐܪܥ 6, 18; 28, 12.
ܬܚܝܬ ܐܕܡ 13, 4; 14, 1, 4; 35, 2.
ܬܚܝܬ ܫܡܫ 4, 14; 5, 13; 6, 3, 8, 10; 7, 16; 11, 22, 23; 12, 13; 17, 10; 22, 11, 12; 23, 13, 19; 34, 5; 38, 7.
ܬܚܬܝܬܐ 38, 9, 11; 42, 8.
ܐܬܬܚܝܬ 17, 1.
ܬܚܠܠ 5, 12; 9, 8, 9, 11; 17, 1; 20, 7.
ܬܠ (v.) 6, 9 (bis); 18, 5; 25, 3.
ܬܚܠܝܐ 7, 1.
ܬܚܠ̈ܬܐ 6, 9.
ܬܚܠܬܐ 28, 13.
ܬܘܚܠܬܐ 11, 2; 20, 5.
ܬܡܚܐ 42, 12.

Digitized by Google

ܟܢ̈ܦܐ 28, 5.
ܟܢܫ 22, 2.
ܐܬܟܢܫ 10, 5; 17, 14; 23, 17.
ܟܘܢܫܬܐ 42, 14.
ܟܣܐ 19, 1, 2.
ܐܬܟܣܝ 24, 5; 25, 8.
ܬܟܣܝܬܐ 20, 6; 25, 8.
ܟܘܪܗܢܐ 25, 9.
ܟܘܪ̈ܗܢܐ 18, 3.
ܐܟܪܙ 33, 5.
ܐܬܟܪܟ 38, 14.
ܟܪܟ 22, 6 (B); 34, 3.
ܟܪܣܐ 19, 6; 28, 2.
ܟܬܒ 23, 21; 26, 8.
ܐܬܟܬܒ 9, 11.
ܟܬܒܐ 9, 11, 12.

ܠܗ (31 times).
ܠܗܘܢ (20 times).
ܠܗ̇ (6 times).
ܠܗܝܢ (once in H, thrice in B).
ܠܗ̇ܘ (5 times).
ܠܟ (55 times in H and 57 in B).
ܠܟܝ (7 times).
ܠܝ (10 times).
ܠܟܘܢ (14 times).
ܠܐ (118 times).
ܕܠܐ (with a substantive, i. e. '*without*')
4, 4; 7, 1, 23; 8, 23; 9, 4; 10, 2; 11, 12; 12, 5 (bis); 13, 4; 15, 6, 10 (bis); 17, 2, 12; 20, 5, 7; 21, 5; 22, 11; 23, 4; 25, 7; 28, 5, 6; 31, 7; 38, 3, 13; 39, 6, 8; 40, 6 (bis).
ܡܠܐ̈ܟܐ (ܪ̈ܝܫ) 4, 8.

ܠܒܐ 4, 3; 7, 23; 8, 1, 20; 10, 1, 6; 11, 1; 16, 2, 13; 18, 1; 20, 4; 21, 8; 24, 11, 26, 2, 4; 28, 1, 2, 19; 30, 5; 32, 1; 34, 1; 36, 7; 37, 2; 38, 14; 41, 10; 42, 19.
ܠܒ̈ܘܬܐ 8, 1; 17, 13; 41, 6.
ܠܒܫ 4, 6, 8; 7, 4; 13, 3; 15, 8; 20, 7; 21, 3; 23, 1, 3; 33, 12; 39, 8.
ܐܠܒܫ 3, 1.
ܠܒܘܫܐ 8, 9; 11, 11,
ܠܒܘ̈ܫܐ 25, 8.
ܠܘܬ 3, 2, 6; 4, 11; 7, 2, 24; 10, 3; 11, 2, 9; 12, 9; 13, 4; 14, 1, 2, 6; 15, 6; 17, 14; 21, 4; 23, 16; 25, 1, 6; 26, 2, 4; 28, 1, 4; 31, 4, 13; 33, 4; 35, 7 (bis); 37, 1 (bis), 2, 3; 41, 2; 42, 1, 4, 14 (B), 15, 17.
ܠܠܝܐ 16, 15, 16; 41, 7.
ܠܡ see ܐܠܡ ܠܐ.
ܠܡ ܗ̄ܘܐ 24, 9, 12; 28, 11.
ܠܡܠܐ 40, 3 (B).
ܠܡܐܠܐ 38, 3.

ܡܐ ܕ 11, 21.
ܕܠܡܐ 18, 4.
ܡܢܝ 4, 13; 5, 3; 28, 18.
ܡܕܡ 4, 11, 13; 5, 7, 14; 6, 3, 5 (bis); 7, 9, 23; 8, 9 (bis); 11, 23; 12, 9; 16, 8, 18; 17, 10; 23, 16; 25, 7; 31, 9; 34, 3, 5; 38, 5. See also ܟܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܡܕܡܐ (ܕܠܐ) 13, 4; 20, 5; 39, 6.

Digitized by Google

ܡܝܬ 3, 8; 5, 14; 11, 7; 24, 4; 28, 7; 42, 5, 15.
ܡܝ̈ܬܐ 22, 8 (bis); 42, 14.
ܡܘܬܐ 6, 15; 15, 9; 18, 8; 28, 17; 29, 4; 38, 8; 42, 11, 17.
ܕܠܐ ܡܘܬܐ 3, 8; 10, 2; 15, 10; 28, 6; 31, 7; 38, 3; 40, 6.
ܡܚܠ 19, 4.
ܐܬܡܚܠ 3, 7.
ܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ 34, 1.
ܡܛܠ 7, 16; 9, 9; 11, 17; 14, 5 (bis); 18, 4, 5; 26, 11 (H); 31, 12.
ܡܛܠ ܕ 3, 6, 7 (bis); 4, 2, 7; 5, 1, 2, 11, 15; 6, 18; 7, 4 (bis), 5, 6 (bis), 11, 12, 19, 21; 8, 14, 21; 10, 5; 12, 1, 3, 11; 14, 2; 15, 2; 16, 2, 18; 17, 10, 15; 18, 3, 9, 10, 14; 19, 3, 8, 9; 21, 2; 23, 9, 16, 17; 24, 1, 6, 9, 12, 13; 25, 2, 4, 9; 26, 1, 2, 11 (B); 27, 2; 28, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19; 29, 11; 30, 1, 3, 5; 31, 5, 12; 32, 3; 38, 4, 5, 15, 16; 39, 7; 41, 8; 42, 1, 3 (B), 5, 13, 14, 18, 20.
ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ 7, 10; 16, 3; 28, 3; 41, 2.
ܡ̈ܝܐ 6, 9, 13, 18; 11, 6, 7; 12, 2; 16, 10; 28, 15; 30, 1, 4; 40, 2.
ܡܟܟ 29, 5, 8.
ܐܬܡܟܟ 8, 3; 41, 12.
ܡܟܝܟܘܬܐ 31, 12.
ܡܟܐ 39, 11 (bis).
ܡܠܐ 4, 13; 8, 5.
ܡܡܠܠܐ 17, 9.
ܡܠܠ 6, 1, 2 (bis); 8, 2, 4; 9, 1; 10, 2; 12, 1, 8, 9, 11; 16, 5; 18, 15; 26, 2, 10; 31, 3 (bis); 33, 10; 37, 2; 42, 6, 14.
ܡ̈ܠܠܐ 11, 6.
ܡܠܬܐ 10, 1; 12, 8; 15, 9; 16, 7, 8, 14, 19; 29, 9, 10; 39, 9; 41, 11, 14.
ܡ̈ܠܐ 6, 10; 11, 2, 23; 12, 1; 30, 1; 38, 18.
ܡܠܟ 16, 17.
ܐܬܡܠܟ 19, 3.
ܡܫܡܠܝܘܬܐ 36, 6.
ܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ 23, 21.
ܡܫܡܠܝܐ 7, 11, 13; 9, 4; 17, 7; 18, 5, 8; 19, 5; 23, 4; 26, 7; 35, 6; 36, 2; 41, 13.
ܐܡܢܥ 23, 22.
ܡܢܥܘܬܐ 18, 3; 22, 12; 23, 12.
ܡܢ (140 times).
ܡܢ 38, 10; (cf. 18, 7).
ܡܢ cf. 18, 7.
ܡܢܘ 3, 4; 4, 6; 8, 19; 23, 1, 2, 3, 10 (bis); 26, 8, 9, 10, 11.
ܡ̈ܢܬܐ 6, 1.
ܡܥܐ 14, 10.
ܡܥ̈ܝܬܐ 22, 2.
ܡܥܬܐ 30, 6.
ܡܪܬܐ 22, 7.
ܡܪ̈ܪܐ 11, 21; 42, 12 (H).
ܡܪ̈ܪܐ 42, 12 (B).
ܡܪܝܪܘܬܐ 28, 15; 31, 12.

ܡܪܝܐ 3, 3, 6, 10; 4, 3, 15; 5, 1, 10, 11, 15; 6, 2, 3, 6, 18; 7, 2, 3, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23; 8, 1, 2, 6, 22; 9, 3, 4, 11; 10, 1; 11, 1, 6, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18; 12, 3, 13; 13, 1; 14, 1, 3, 6, 8; 15, 1, 10; 16, 1, 3, 5, 8, 18; 17, 16; 18, 3, 4; 19, 1; 20, 1, 4, 7; 21, 1, 5, 9; 23, 4 (B bis); 24, 5, 7, 10, 13; 25, 11 (bis); 26, 1, 8, 11; 29, 1, 6 (bis), 10; 30, 1, 2, 5 (bis); 31, 1, 2; 35, 1, 4, 5; 36, 1, 2, 3; 37, 1 (B), 4; 38, 16, 19; 39, 1, 7 (bis), 9; 40, 2; 41, 1, 3, 5, 7, 16.

ܡܪܢ 14, 4; 17, 2; 27, 1; 37, 1 (H); 42, 1.

ܡܪܝ 24, 1 (B); 39, 11.

ܡܪܐ 28, 13.

ܐܡܪܢ 23, 20.

ܡܫܚ 36, 6.

ܡܫܝܚܐ 9, 3; 17, 16; 24, 1; 29, 6; 39, 11; 41, 3, 15.

ܡܫܩܠܐ 25, 8 (B ܡܫܩܐ).

ܡܫܬܠܡ 4, 4; 12, 6.

ܡܬܠ 16, 11; 42, 9.

ܡܬܠܐ 27, 2; 42, 1.

ܐܬܠ 21, 8; 26, 1.

ܡܬܘܡܐܝܬ 11, 6; 26, 13; 30, 1, 2; 40, 2.

ܡܬܘܡܝܐ 4, 10.

ܢܒܥ 33, 4.

ܐܬܢܒܥ 31, 11.

ܢܒܥܐ 38, 8.

ܢܗܪܐ 6, 8; 26, 13.

ܢܗܝܪܘܬܐ 23, 14; 39, 1, 8.

ܢܗܪ 40, 4; 41, 6.

ܐܢܗܪ 11, 14; 41, 4.

ܢܗܝܪܐ 16, 16; 18, 6; 34, 2; 36, 3.

ܢܘܗܪܐ 5, 6; 6, 17; 7, 14; 8, 2; 10, 1, 6; 11, 11, 19; 12, 3, 7; 15, 2; 16, 15; 21, 3, 6; 25, 7; 29, 7; 32, 1; 38, 1; 41, 6, 14.

ܐܢܝܚ 6, 14; 7, 15; 11, 12; 30, 3; 38, 4.

ܐܬܢܝܚ 16, 12; 26, 10, 12; 28, 3; 30, 2, 7; 35, 6; 36, 1.

ܢܝܚܐ 3, 5; 25, 12; 26, 3; 37, 4.

ܢܝܚܘܬܐ 14, 6; 20, 8; 26, 12; 35, 1 (B).

ܢܝܚܬܐ 35, 1 (H).

ܡܢܝܚܬܐ 12, 6.

ܢܛܪ 40, 1.

ܢܛܪ 8, 10, 11, 22.

ܢܛܪ 18, 7; 19, 11; 35, 2.

ܐܬܢܛܪ 8, 10, 11.

ܢܝܪܐ 42, 7, 8.

ܢܟܠ 20, 6.

ܡܢܩܦܬܐ 12, 4.

ܢܡܘܣܐ 3, 6; 6, 3; 20, 6.

ܢܦܠ 4, 13; 5, 3; 7, 4; 9, 7, 10; 11, 4; 14, 3; 15, 6; 17, 4; 19, 5, 6; 22, 9; 23, 2, 7, 19; 29, 9; 30, 2; 31, 2 (B), 7; 41, 1.

ܢܦܘܠܬܐ 7, 23.

ܢܦܫ 18, 15.

ܢܦܫܐ 18, 15.

ܢܦܩ 5, 5; 6, 16; 9, 6; 12, 6; 18, 2; 37, 2; 38, 15.

Digitized by Google

ܢܦܩ 28, 17 (B and H on margin).
ܢܦܩ 6, 8, 15; 7, 17; 28, 6 (H); 30, 5; 31, 6; 35, 3; 42, 17.
ܐܦܩ 33, 8; 40, 2; 42, 16.
ܢܦܩܐ 3, 5; 7, 3, 12, 23; 9, 2 (bis); 20, 5 (bis), 6; 21, 4; 26, 9 (bis); 30, 3; 31, 7; 32, 2; 35, 7; 38, 15; 40, 4.
ܢܦܩܬܐ 6, 15; 10, 3; 39, 3; 41, 11, 16.
ܢܨܚ 11, 18; 38, 16.
ܐܬܢܨܚ 11, 21.
ܢܨܚܬܐ 38, 19, 20, 21.
ܢܩܝܐ 30, 3.
ܐܬܢܩܦ 3, 8.
ܢܩܦܬܐ 11, 15.
ܢܩܦ 28, 6.

ܣܒܠ 31, 12.
ܣܒܪ 7, 12; 18, 12; 28, 9; 38, 8; cf. 42, 5.
ܐܣܬܒܪ 7, 4; 17, 6; 34, 5; 42, 10.
ܣܒܪ 7, 17; 9, 6; 13, 2; 42, 5.
ܣܒܪܐ 5, 2, 10; 29, 1; 40, 1.
ܡܣܒܪܢܐ 12, 4.
ܣܓܪ 31, 10, 11; 42, 13.
ܣܓܝ (v.) 8, 1.
ܐܣܓܝ 6, 6; cf. 8, 22; 12, 3.
ܣܓܝ 11, 23; 30, 4.
ܣܓܝܐܐ (s. and pl.) 7, 10, 17; 19, 7, 10; 23, 7, 15, 19; 25, 5; 38, 12; 42, 11.
ܣܘܓܐܐ 14, 9; 16, 7; 23, 14.
ܣܓܝܪ 11, 17; 39, 13.
ܣܕܪܐ 38, 2.

ܣܗܕ 22, 5.
ܐܣܗܕ 14, 3.
ܡܣܗܕܢܐ 23, 20.
ܐܣܝ (sic) 8, 22.
ܐܣܬܘܝ 30, 6.
ܣܘܣܐ 12, 5.
ܣܝܡ 4, 1; 7, 13, 14; 8, 20; 9, 8, 10, 11; 18, 7; 20, 8; 25, 7; 38, 3, 17; 42, 19, 20 (B).
ܐܬܬܣܝܡ 10, 6; 28, 5; 38, 16; 39, 13.
ܣܝܡܬܐ 16, 15 (bis).
ܣܟܠܐ 33, 3 (bis).
ܣܘܟܐ (?) 12, 7.
ܐܣܬܟܠ 8, 15.
ܐܣܟܢ 41, 11; 42, 7.
ܐܣܬܟܢ 24, 11; 25, 5; 42, 10.
ܣܘܠܠܐ 28, 11.
ܣܠܩ 15, 10; 38, 1, 18 (B).
ܐܣܩ 22, 1; 29, 4; 38, 18 (H).
ܣܘܠܩܐ 35, 7.
ܣܡܡܢܐ 38, 8.
ܐܣܬܡܟ 20, 8.
ܣܡܠܐ 25, 7.
ܐܣܬܢ 28, 12.
ܣܢܐܬܐ 7, 20.
ܣܦܘܬܐ 6, 14; 8, 1; 11, 6; 12, 2; 16, 2; 20, 4; 21, 8; 30, 5; 37, 2; 38, 20; 40, 2; 42, 14.
ܣܦܣܪܐ 28, 4.
ܣܦܩ 26, 12.
ܣܦܣܛܐ 19, 3, 8.
ܣܪܘܬܐ 18, 11.
ܣܪܚ 39, 2.
ܣܪܩ 31, 13; 33, 1.

Digitized by Google

ܐܣܬܪܩ 18, 12.
ܣܪܝܩܐ (s. and pl.) 5, 9; 18, 12; 38, 2 (B).
ܣܪܝܩܘܬܐ 11, 8; 17, 3.
ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ 28, 17.
ܣܪܝܩܘܬܐ 18, 9.

ܥܘܠܐ 19, 4.
ܥܒܕ 4, 2, 15; 7, 9, 12; 11, 1, 20; 12, 10; 14, 7; 15, 7; 16, 13, 16; 20, 7; 23, 15; 28, 12; 29, 2, 9; 36, 5; 38, 13; 42, 14, 16.
ܡܥܒܕ 29, 8.
ܐܬܥܒܕ 16, 14.
ܥܒܕܐ 29, 11.
ܥܒܕܐ 11, 22; 12, 4.
ܥܒܕܐ 8, 18, 19; 12, 7; 16, 1 (thrice), 6.
ܥܒܕܐ 7, 8; 11, 20; 16, 12, 13; 18, 5.
ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ 22, 10 (B).
ܥܘܒܕܐ 5, 7.
ܥܒܪ 23, 15; 39, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13.
ܐܥܒܪ 25, 9; 38, 2.
ܡܥܒܪܢܘܬܐ 39, 2.
ܥܓܠ 7, 9.
ܥܕܡܐ 6, 4; 7, 14; 8, 1; 11, 4; 14, 4; 16, 2; 23, 16; 26, 5, 6, 7; 30, 6; 33, 3.
ܥܕܪ 22, 6.
ܥܘܕܪܢܐ 25, 6; 26, 13.
ܡܥܕܪܢܐ 7, 3; 8, 6; 21, 2; 25, 2.
ܡܥܕܪܢܘܬܐ 21, 5.
ܡܥܕܪܢܘܬܐ 22, 10 (H).
ܥܘܠܐ 23, 15 (H).

ܥܘܠܐ 28, 2.
ܥܘܠܡܘܬܐ 7, 1.
ܥܘܪܐ 18, 11; 29, 10.
ܐܬܥܘܪ 23, 20 (B); 39, 12.
ܐܬܥܝܪ 23, 20 (H).
ܥܝܢܐ 16, 9.
ܥܝܢܐ 5, 5; 6, 17; 11, 14; 13, 1; 14, 1 (bis); 15, 3; 25, 5 (bis).
ܐܬܥܝܪ 3, 11.
ܥܝܪܘܬܐ 8, 2.
ܥܠ (v.) 33, 8.
ܐܥܠ 7, 1.
ܥܠ (prep.) (63 times).
ܥܠܠ 34, 4, 5; 35, 1.
ܡܢ ܥܠ 11, 12.
ܥܠܡܐ 10, 4; 19, 5; 20, 3; 22, 11; 33, 12; 38, 11; 41, 15.
ܥܠܡܐ 7, 11; 12, 4, 8; 16, 19.
ܠܥܠܡ 6, 18; 9, 4, 8; 11, 22, 24; 38, 17 (H); 41, 16.
ܠܥܠܡܝܢ 38, 17 (B).
ܠܥܠܡ ܥܠܡܝܢ 10, 6; 23, 22; 25, 12; 32, 3.
ܥܡ 5, 15 (bis); 7, 20; 8, 6, 21; 10, 6; 23, 12; 25, 4; 38, 4, 5, 15; 41, 11; 42, 6, 11, 12, 14 (H), 16, 18.
ܥܡܐ 31, 12; cf. 10, 6.
ܥܡܡܐ 10, 5; 23, 15 (B); 29, 8.
ܥܡܘܛܐ 5, 5.
ܥܡܠܐ 37, 3.
ܥܡܩ 38, 18 (H).
ܐܥܡܩ 38, 18 (B).
ܥܘܡܩܐ 34, 2; 42, 12.
ܥܘܡܩܐ 29, 4.
ܥܢܐ 32, 1.

Digitized by Google

ܐܬܒܥܝ 10, 2.
ܡܬܒܥܝܢܐ 22, 12.
ܒܥܘܬܐ 24, 3.
ܒܥܝܪܐ 5, 5; 35, 1; 36, 7.
ܒܥܘܠܐ 11, 1.
ܒܥܠ 28, 6 (B).
ܒܥܠܕܒܒܐ 7, 14; 10, 6; 39, 10, 11.
ܒܨܪ 23, 15.
ܒܨܝܪܐ 22, 5 (B); 38, 17.
ܒܨܪܐ 22, 5 (H).
ܡܒܩܝܐ 26, 5.
ܒܩܘܬܐ 5, 5.
ܒܪܐ 18, 6; 23, 8, 20; 25, 1; 38, 6.
ܒܪܬܐ 39, 2.
ܐܬܒܪܝ 10, 4; 18, 2; 32, 3.
ܒܪܝܬܐ 39, 1.
ܒܪܘܢܐ 16, 7; 25, 6; 29, 8.
ܒܪܟ 28, 5 (H).
ܐܬܒܪܟ 5, 9; 28, 5 (B).
ܒܪܟܐ 9, 5; 11, 9.
ܒܪܟܬܐ (s. and pl.) 4, 10; 26, 13.
ܒܬܘܠܬܐ 11, 16; 41, 10.

ܓܐܪܐ 10, 2.
ܓܐܪܐ 4, 4; 7, 1; 8, 2; 11, 1, 12, 23; 12, 2; 14, 6, 7; 16, 2; 17, 13; 37, 3; 38, 17.
ܓܒܝܐ 18, 3.
ܓܒܝܐ 22, 9; 39, 3.
ܓܘܕܐ 7, 24 (bis); 8, 4; 10, 1; 12, 2, 3, 11; 16, 5; 18, 8; 21, 8; 26, 10; 29, 4; 31, 3; 36, 7.
ܓܘܙܠܐ 28, 1 (bis); 42, 6.
ܐܬܓܘܫ 30, 4.
ܓܘܫܐ 38, 2.
ܐܬܓܘܫܡ 8, 19; 39, 8.

ܓܠܐ 28, 4b; 34, 4.
ܓܠܐ 31, 9.
ܓܠܐ 7, 15; 20, 3.
ܓܠܝܢܐ 16, 2, 6; 38, 19.
ܐܬܓܠܚ 25, 1.
ܐܬܓܠܙ 10, 3.
ܐܬܓܠܙ 11, 9; 33, 6.
ܐܬܓܡܪ 15, 5.
ܓܡܘܪܐ 14, 2.
ܓܡܝܪܐ 23, 21.
ܓܡܪ 23, 13.
ܐܬܓܡܪ 17, 4.
ܓܢܒ 38, 14 (H).
ܓܢܒܝܐ 23, 17.
ܓܢܒ 38, 14 (B).
ܓܢܒܐ 28, 13.
ܓܢܘܒܐ 28, 1 (bis).
ܓܢܒܪܐ 11, 16, 18, 23, 24; 20, 7.
ܓܢܐ 17, 9 (bis).
ܓܢܣ 24, 1, 4 (B).
ܓܢܣܐ 24, 4 (H).
ܓܢܘܢܐ 20, 6.
ܓܢܘܢܐ 11, 14; 15, 9; 17, 4; 22, 11; 25, 4; 31, 5; 42, 13.
ܓܢܘܢܐ 8, 15.
ܓܢܙ 8, 22; 25, 4; 31, 12; 38, 2.
ܐܬܓܢܙ 8, 22; 9, 5, 12; 14, 5; 17, 4, 14; 26, 9; 33, 10, 11; 34, 6; 35, 7; 38, 16; 42, 18.
ܓܢܘܙܐ 41, 11; 42, 18.
ܓܢܘܢܝܐ 5, 11; 7, 16; 11, 3; 15, 6; 17, 2; 18, 7; 19, 11; 21, 2; 25, 2; 28, 10; 31, 13; 34, 4; 35, 2; 38, 3; 40, 5.
ܓܢܫ 3, 4; 22, 8.
ܓܢܫ 27, 1; 35, 7; 37, 1; 42, 1.

ܦܫܝܛܐ 34, 1; 42, 2.
ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ 7, 3; 27, 3; 42, 2.
ܡܦܫܩܢܘܬܐ 12, 11.
ܐܬܦܫܪ 17, 9; 31, 1.
ܦܬܚ 38, 18 (H).
ܐܬܦܬܚ 7, 13; 16, 10; 24, 13; 38, 18 (B).
ܦܬܝܐ 6, 8; 23, 15.
ܦܬܓܡܐ 7, 7; 8, 8; 9, 3; 12, 3, 5, 10, 12; 18, 4; 24, 9; 32, 2; 37, 3; 42, 14.
ܦܬܓܡ̈ܐ 12, 1.
ܦܬܚ 4, 10; 7, 24; 8, 1 (bis); 9, 1; 10, 1; 13, 1; 14, 8; 16, 5; 17, 8; 19, 4; 31, 3; 42, 17.
ܐܬܦܬܚ 8, 4; 24, 5; 30, 1; 36, 7.
ܦܬܚܐ 17, 10.

ܨܒܝ̈ܢܐ 13, 3.
ܨܒܐ 8, 20; 9, 12; 10, 3.
ܐܨܛܒܬ 3, 9; 8, 17.
ܨܒܝܢܐ 6, 14; 9, 4; 14, 4; 18, 3, 8; 19, 10; 23, 5.
ܨܒܝ̈ܢܐ 9, 3.
ܨܒܘܬܐ 23, 21.
ܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ 16, 6; 23, 8.
ܐܨܛܒܬ 38, 9.
ܨܘܪܐ (s. and pl.) 6, 11 (bis); 30, 2.
ܨܦܪܐ 7, 6.

ܩܒܠ 7, 10; 8, 8; 9, 5; 11, 14; 17, 14; 18, 7; 20, 9; 23, 11; 31, 6; 41, 3.
ܡܩܒܠܢܘܬܐ 40, 6.
ܡܩܒܠܐ 16, 17.
ܠܩܘܒܠ 6, 5; 8, 19; 25, 3, 11.
ܩܘܒܠܐ 6, 5.
ܩܘ̈ܒܠܐ 23, 14.
ܩܒܪܐ 22, 8.
ܩܒܪܢܝܬܐ 16, 1.
ܐܬܩܕܡ 28, 19.
ܩܕܡ 4, 14; 7, 18 (bis); 8, 21; 9, 12; 14, 5; 17, 9; 20, 9; 21, 6; 28, 18; 36, 2.
ܡܢ ܩܕܡ 4, 2; 8, 7, 15; 15, 9; 16, 18; 28, 5; 31, 1; 33, 2; 36, 3; 41, 15.
ܡܢ ܩܕܡܝܢ 41, 14.
ܡܢ ܠܩܘܕܡ 24, 7.
ܩܕܫ 27, 1.
ܩܕܝܫܐ 4, 2; 19, 2, 4; 23, 22 (H).
ܩܘܕܫܐ 4, 1; 6, 7; 7, 16 (pl.); 8, 2 (pl.), 16; 9, 3; 11, 2; 14, 8; 15, 3; 22, 12 (pl.); 23, 1 (pl.), 22 (B); 26, 2; 31, 5; 32, 3.
ܩܕܝܫܘܬܐ 13, 3.
ܩܘܡ 8, 22; 14, 6; 24, 9; 26, 11.
ܩܠܐ 7, 24; 24, 2; 31, 4; 33, 3; 37, 1, 2; 42, 19.
ܩ̈ܠܐ 7, 17.
ܩܡ 6, 5; 8, 3, 19; 12, 6 (bis); 16, 13; 18, 3; 25, 3; 26, 12; 31, 8, 11; 33, 3, 5; 42, 6.
ܩܝܡ 5, 13; 39, 10, 11.
ܐܩܝܡ 6, 14, 16; 15, 2; 16, 12; 22, 5; 35, 1; 36, 2.
ܐܬܩܝܡ 8, 3.
ܩܝܡܐ 9, 11.
ܩܛܝܪܐ 23, 6.
ܩܛ̈ܠܐ 14, 8.

Digitized by Google

ܩܛܠܐ 27, 3; 39, 10; 42, 2.
ܩܛܝܠܐ 39, 4.
ܩܛܘܠܘܬܐ 12, 5 (bis).
ܩܠܐ 11, 11; 15, 3; 19, 10; 20, 6; 23, 3; 33, 12; 41, 9.
ܩܠܝܦܘܣ 38, 5; 39, 8.
ܩܢܐ 33, 5 (B); 42, 15.
ܩܢܝܐ 16, 1.
ܩܪܐ 23, 7, 10; 26, 8; 33, 5 (H); 38, 12.
ܩܪܒ 11, 6.
ܩܪ̈ܒ 7, 22; 20, 2, 5; 31, 4.
ܐܬܩܪܒ 19, 1; 33, 7; 42, 1, 17.
ܩܪܒܐ 8, 7; 9, 6; 29, 9.
ܩܪ̈ܒܐ 9, 9.
ܩܘܪܒܐ 36, 8.
ܩܘܪܒܢܐ 20, 2, 4.
ܩܪܝܒܐ (s. and pl.) 6, 15; 7, 19; 20, 6; 21, 7; 36, 6.
ܩܪܡ 22, 9.
ܩܫܝܫܐ 4, 3; 28, 17.
ܩܫܐ 34, 1.
ܩܫܬܐ 23, 6.
ܩܫܛܪܐ 6, 1; 7, 17; 14, 8; 26, 3.

ܪ̈ܒܐ 6, 8; 18, 12; 23, 21; 36, 4; 41, 4.
ܪܘܪܒܢܐ 36, 4.
ܐܬܪܘܪܒ 38, 18.
ܪܒ ܡܠܐܟܐ 4, 8.
ܪܒܘܬܐ 7, 3, 23; 15, 7; 18, 16; 19, 11; 29, 3; 36, 5.
ܪ̈ܒ 17, 7 (?).
ܐܬܪܒ 35, 6.
ܪܓܡ 39, 9.
ܪ̈ܓܠܐ 23, 16 (bis); 36, 2; 42, 13.
ܪܕܐ 12, 2; 26, 9; 40, 1.
ܐܪܕܝ 4, 10.
ܪܕܝܐ 12, 2.
ܪܕܦ 23, 20; 42, 7.
ܐܬܪܕܦ 28, 8.
ܪ̈ܕܘܦܐ 5, 4; 42, 5.
ܐܬܪܗܒ 35, 3.
ܡܪܗܒ 14, 9.
ܪܗܛ 11, 3; 12, 11; 16, 13; 23, 7, 16; 33, 1; 42, 15.
ܪܗܛܐ 7, 1 (bis); 16, 13.
ܪܘܐ 11, 7.
ܪܘܝܘܬܐ 11, 8; 38, 12.
ܪܘܙ 11, 12; 40, 4.
ܪܘܚܐ 3, 10; 6, 2, 7; 11, 2; 13, 2; 14, 8; 16, 5; 19, 2, 4; 23, 22; 25, 8; 28, 1, 7; 29, 10; 36, 1, 8; 40, 4.
ܪ̈ܘܚܬܐ 6, 7.
ܪܡܐ 33, 3.
ܪܘܡܐ 36, 1 (B), 2.
ܪ̈ܘܡܐ 26, 7.
ܡܪܘܡܐ 17, 7; 21, 1; 22, 1; 23, 5; 36, 1 (H).
ܡܪ̈ܘܡܐ 10, 5.
ܡܪܝܡܐ 3, 6; 5, 2; 6, 12; 7, 16, 22; 8, 8; 9, 5; 10, 4; 11, 2, 9; 12, 4, 11; 17, 7; 18, 1, 14, 15; 23, 4 (H), 18; 26, 10; 28, 19; 29, 11; 31, 4; 32, 3; 35, 7; 36, 5; 37, 1; 39, 8; 41, 13.
ܐܪܝܡ 17, 7; 21, 1, 2; 25, 8, 9; 29, 3; 31, 4; 36, 1; 37, 1.

Digitized by Google

ܐܬܪܚܡ 7, 20; 8, 5 (bis); 18, 1; 21, 6; 24, 11; 39, 11; 41, 12.
ܪܚܡܬܘܢ 26, 4; 29, 3.
ܪܚܡ 3, 3 (bis), 5, 7 (bis); 5, 1; 8, 13 (bis); 13, 3; 40, 1.
ܐܬܪܚܡ 3, 4.
ܪ̈ܚܡܐ 14, 3, 9; 16, 7; 19, 7; 20, 5 (bis); 29, 3.
ܪܚܡܬܐ 3, 4; 8, 22.
ܪܚܡܘܬܐ 12, 9.
ܪܚܡܐ 3, 5, 7; 7, 1.
ܡܪܚܡܢܐ 3, 6.
ܐܪܚܩ 18, 3 (H).
ܐܬܪܚܩ 18, 3 (B).
ܪ̈ܚܝܩܐ 24, 4.
ܪܚܝܩ 11, 15.
ܪܘܚܐ 5, 12; 9, 8; 17, 15, 16; 20, 8; 23, 16, 18 (bis); 24, 1 (B bis); 26, 7; 28, 4; 33, 3; 35, 1; 39, 1; 42, 13, 20.
ܪ̈ܘܚܐ 5, 7; 22, 5; 31, 13.
ܢܦܫ ܪܘܚܬܐ 11, 4.
ܢܦܫ ܒܪܘܚܐ 4, 14; 6, 4; 7, 14; 23, 2, 3; 24, 8; 41, 9.
ܡܪܘܚܘܬܐ 38, 1.
ܪܘܚ (v.) 22, 2.
ܐܪܘܚ 29, 10; 42, 7.
ܐܬܪܘܚܘܬܐ 41, 15.
ܪܙܐ 42, 10.
ܪܙ 4, 10.
ܪܙܝܐ 35, 1.
ܪ̈ܙܝܐ 4, 10.
ܐܬܪܟܒ 4, 2.
ܪܟܒܐ 28, 14; 38, 13.
ܐܬܪܟܒܘܬܐ 5, 7, 8; 9, 4, 5; 12, 4; 18, 14; 28, 14, 19; 38, 21.
ܐܪܦ 42, 13.
ܪܦܫ 17, 9.

ܫܐܠ 38, 10.
ܫܐܠܬܐ 14, 9.
ܫܒܐ 10, 3, 4.
ܫܒܝܬܐ 10, 3.
ܫܒܚ 6, 7; 7, 19, 24; 14, 8; 17, 7 (H); 18, 1; 21, 7; 26, 4; 36, 2, 4; 41, 1.
ܐܫܬܒܚ 38, 19.
ܫܒܝܚܐ 17, 7 (B).
ܫܘܒܚܐ 11, 24.
ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ 6, 7; 10, 4; 11, 17; 12, 4; 14, 5; 16, 5, 20; 17, 16; 18, 16; 20, 9 (bis), 10; 21, 9; 26, 1, 5; 29, 2, 11; 31, 3; 36, 2; 40, 2 (bis); 41, 16.
ܬܫܒ̈ܚܬܐ 13, 2; 16, 1, 2; 41, 4.
ܫܒܝܠܐ 22, 5.
ܫܒܩ 5, 2; 11, 8, 10; 15, 6; 17, 11; 24, 4; 33, 1, 3, 7; 38, 4, 14.
ܫܓܝ 11, 10 (bis); 18, 4 (B); 21, 2.
ܐܫܬܕܪ 19, 3; 23, 6.
ܐܫܬܕܪܪ 23, 6.
ܫܘܐ 13, 3.
ܐܫܘܐ 22, 7.
ܐܫܬܘܐ 41, 5.
ܫܘܝܘܬܐ 12, 9, 10.
ܫܘܚ 11, 12.
ܐܫܬܘܫܛ 8, 5; 25, 5.
ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ 31, 2.
ܫܘܩܐ 11, 5.
ܫܘܠܡܘܬܐ 4, 9; 21, 5
ܫܘܦܪܘܬܐ 11, 10.

Digitized by Google

ܫܟܚ 6, 8.
ܫܟܠ 15, 9; 29, 4; 42, 11.
ܐܫܟܚ 3, 4, 7; 6, 9; 26, 11; 28, 7, 17; 42, 13.
ܫܟܝܚܘܬܐ 38, 21 (sic).
ܡܫܟܚܢܐ 12, 12.
ܫܠܐ 26, 3; 31, 10; 35, 4.
ܫܠܝܐ 8, 4.
ܫܠܚ 11, 10; 15, 8; 21, 3.
ܫܠܝܚܐ 23, 9.
ܫܘܠܚܐ 4, 2; 22, 4.
ܫܠܡ 39, 13.
ܫܠܡܐ 8, 7; 9, 6; 10, 2; 11, 3; 35, 1; 36, 8.
ܫܘܠܡܐ 24, 8.
ܫܡܐ 6, 7; 8, 21, 23; 14, 5; 15, 8; 16, 20; 18, 1, 16; 20, 10; 22, 6; 23, 22; 25, 11; 30, 5; 31, 3; 33, 13; 39, 7, 8, 13; 41, 5, 16; 42, 20.
ܐܫܬܡܥܘ 36, 3.
ܫܡܥܐ 16, 11.
ܫܡܥ 8, 8; 9, 6; 15, 4; 16, 9; 23, 10; 33, 10; 37, 2; 42, 19.
ܐܫܬܡܥ 24, 2; 33, 4; 38, 5.
ܫܡܫܐ 11, 13; 15, 1, 2; 16, 15, 16.
ܡܫܡܫܢܐ 6, 13.
ܫܢ̈ܐ 4, 5.
ܫܢܝ 11, 19.
ܫܦܪ 14, 5.
ܫܦܝܪܐ (s. and pl.) 7, 2; 11, 20; 30, 3; 34, 3.
ܐܫܦܥ 38, 17.
ܫܦܠ 29, 10.
ܫܩܠܐ 38, 2.
ܐܫܬܩܠ 11, 5; 36, 8; 38, 16; 40, 5.
ܫܪܪܐ 8, 8, 12; 9, 8; 11, 3, 5; 12, 1, 2, 12, 13; 14, 7; 15, 4; 17, 5, 7; 18, 6, 15; 20, 9; 23, 18; 24, 10, 12; 25, 10; 31, 2; 32, 2; 33, 8; 38, 1 (bis), 4, 7, 10, 15; 39, 10; 41, 1, 9, 15, 16.
ܫܪܝܪܐ 9, 11; 12, 3; 18, 3; 31, 11.
ܫܪܐ 15, 2; 17, 11; 18, 4 (H); 22, 4; 23, 9, 10.
ܡܫܪܝܐ 6, 14.
ܐܫܬܪܝ 6, 11; 17, 3; 22, 11; 26, 11.
ܫܪܝܐ 25, 7.
ܫܪܘܝܐ 11, 22.
ܫܬܐܣܬܐ 22, 12; 35, 4.
ܫܬܐܣܐ 38, 16.
ܐܫܬܐܣ 6, 11; 8, 16; 11, 7; 19, 1; 30, 7; 38, 12.
ܡܫܬܝܐ 6, 12, 13; 30, 2.
ܡܫܬܘܬܐ 38, 12.
ܫܬܩ 31, 10.
ܫܬܝܩܐ 12, 8.

ܬܗܡܐ 35, 4.
ܬܘܪ̈ܐ 8, 16; 14, 2; 19, 3, 4.
ܐܬܬܘܝ 27, 2 (B).
ܬܘܩܕܐ 24, 5, 7; 31, 1.
ܐܬܬܘܒ 4, 11.
ܬܘܬܐ 4, 11.
ܬܒ 4, 13.
ܐܬܒ 38, 13; 42, 11.
ܬܘܒ 9, 7; 25, 3; 33, 1
ܬܚܬ 34, 4, 5.
ܬܫ̈ܒܚܬܐ 22, 1.
ܐܬܟܠ 33, 13.

Digitized by Google

ܐܬܬܩܠ 40, 5.
ܬܩܠܐ (s. and pl.) 15, 10; 23, 2.
ܐܬܬܩܢ 42, 2.
ܬܩܢܐ 3, 2.
ܬܩܦܘ 17, 6.
ܬܩܦܘܢ 41, 4.
ܬܩܦ 17, 8; 22, 6.
ܬܩܝܦܐ 35, 3.
ܬܩܝܦܐ 22, 5.
ܡܬܩܝܦܬܐ 12, 4.
ܬܘܩܦܐ 12, 5 (bis).
ܬܩܦܐ 6, 8.
ܐܬܬܩܦ 4, 14; 8, 16; 11, 5; 16, 11, 12; 38, 17; 39, 10.
ܬܘܩܢܐ 33, 2; 36, 2.
ܬܪܥ 26, 11 (bis).
ܐܬܬܪܥ 26, 11.
ܡܬܪܥܢܐ 12, 4.
ܬܪܥ 19, 4.
ܬܪܣ 16, 2.
ܬܪܥܐ 12, 3; 42, 17.
ܬܪ̈ܥܐ 17, 8.
ܬܪܨ 6, 16; 10, 1.
ܐܬܬܪܨ 35, 7.
ܬܪܝܨܐ (s. and pl.) 27, 3; 34, 1; 38, 7; 42, 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INDEX

The order of authors is alphabetical. No notice has been taken of the casual references to the Odes in books and articles which do not treat *ex professo* of the subject.

Abbott (E. A.). Light on the Gospel from an ancient poet. (*Diatessarica*, IX), Cambridge, 1912.

The Original language of the Odes of Solomon. *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1913, 44–45.

The interpretation of early Christian poetry. (*Diatessarica*, X, sect. 11). Cambridge, 1914, 372–456.

Alès (A. d'). Les Odes de Salomon. *Études*, 1911 (CXXIX.), 753–770.

Aytoun (R. A.). The Mysteries of Baptism by Moses bar Kepha compared with the Odes of Solomon. *Expositor*, 1911, 338–358.

Bacon (B. W.). The Odes of the Lord's rest. *Expositor*, 1911, 193–209.

Songs of the Lord's beloved. *Expositor*, 1911, 319–337.

The Odes of Solomon: Christian elements. *Expositor*, 1911, 243–256.

Further light on the Odes of Solomon. *Expositor*, 1912, 459–462.

Barnes (W. E.). The text of the Odes of Solomon. *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1910, 573–575; *ibid.*, p. 615–618; *ibid.*, 1912, 465.

An ancient Christian hymn-book. *Expositor*, 1910, 52–63.

Barth (J.). Zur Textkritik der syrischen Oden Salomos. *Revue Sémit.*, 1911, 261–265.

Batiffol (P.). See under Labourt.

Beer, *Realencyklopädie f. protest. Theologie* (Ergänzungen u. Nachträge, XXIV), 1913, pp. 375–378.

Bernard (J. H.). The Odes of Solomon. *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1910–11, 1–31.

The Odes of Solomon. (*Texts and Studies*, VIII, 3), Cambridge, 1912.

The Odes of Solomon (two Cambridge lectures), London, 1913.

In *Spectator*, October 22, 1910.

Digitized by Google

Böhmer (H.). Die Oden Salomos. *Kirchl. Rundschau für die evangelischen Gemeinden Rheinlands und Westfalens*, 1910, 215–219, 238–243, 266–270, 297–302.

Boysson (A. de). Les Odes de Salomon. *Revue prat. d'Apologétique*, 1911, 497–503.

Brockelmann (C.). In *Literarisches Zentralblatt*, 1912, 313–315.

Bruston (Ch.) Les plus anciens cantiques chrétiens: les Odes de Salomon. *Revue de Théologie et de Philos.*, 1911, 465–497.

La seconde édition du texte des Odes de Salomon. *Revue de Théologie et des Quest. relig.*, 1912, 74–88, 138–151.

Les plus anciens cantiques chrétiens. Traduits sur la seconde édition du texte syriaque avec une introduction et des notes, Genève-Paris, 1912.

Rectifications à la traduction des plus anciens cantiques chrétiens. *Revue de Théol. et des Quest. relig.*, 1912, 440–442, 536–537; and 1913, 85–91.

Quelques observations sur les Odes de Salomon. *Zeitsch. für neutest. Wiss.*, 1912, 111–116.

Büchler (A.) A study of Ode XI, in *Abst. Jour. Society of Hist. Theol.* for 1911–1912, 20–32.

Buhl (F.). Salomos Oder, in *Teolog. Tidskrift* (Copenhagen), 1911, iii, 2, 1.

Bultmann (R.). Ein jüdisch-christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert. *M. für Pastoraltheologie*, Berlin, 1910–11, 23 ff.

Buonaiuti (E.). Il più antico Innario cristiano (in *Rivista storico-critica delle Scienze teologiche*), 1910, pp. 188–200.

Burkitt (F. C.). A new MS. of the Odes of Solomon. *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1912, 372–385; also in *Athenaeum*, 1912, 12.

Capelle (P.). Le odi ed i salmi di Salomone (in *Scuola Cattolica*), 1910, 443–447.

Chajes (H. P.). שירי שלמה. *Magyar Zsidó Szemle* (Budapest), 1911, 113–117; and *Hagoren* (Berditschew), 1911 (VIII), 24–34.

Charles (R. H.). A Church Hymnal of the first century, in '*Times*' *Literary Supplement*, April 7, 1910; also in *Review of theology and philosophy*, 1911, 220–223.

Cheyne (T. K.). In *Hibbert Journal*, 1910, 206–212.

Clemen (C.). Die neuentdeckten Oden Salomos. *Theologische Rundschau*, 1911, 1–19.

Digitized by Google

Colombo (S.). In *Didascaleion*, 1912, 250–262.
Connolly (R. H.). The Odes of Solomon: Jewish or Christian? *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1912, 298–309.
Greek the original language of the Odes of Solomon. *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1913, 530–538; *ibid.*, 44–47; *ibid.*, 311–316; *ibid.*, 1914, 464–468.
Conybeare (F. C.). The Odes of Solomon Montanist. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1911, 70–75.
Note on the Odes of Solomon. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1913, 95.
Diettrich (G.). Eine jüdisch-christliche Liedersammlung. *Reformation*, 1910, 306 ff., 370 ff., 513 ff., 533 ff.
Die Oden Salomos, unter Berücksichtigung der überlieferten Stichengliederung aus dem Syrischen ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem Kommentar versehen. (*Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche*, 9.) Berlin, 1911.
Dünsing (H.). In *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1911, 86–87.
In *Theolog. Literaturzeit.*, 1911, 731.
Flemming (J.). See under Harnack.
Frankenberg (W.). Das Verständnis der Oden Salomos. Giessen, 1911.
Friedländer (M.). Die neuentdeckten Oden Salomos. *Neue Nationalzeitung*, Wien, 1911, Nr. X, 1 f.; XI, 2–4; XII, 2–4; XIII, 6 f.
Fries (S. A.). Die Oden Salomos, montanistische Lieder aus dem zweiten Jahrhundert. *Zeitschr. ür neut. Wiss.*, 1911, 108–125.
Gibson (M. D.). In *Athenæum*, 1914, 530, 559.
Goguel (M.). Les Odes de Salomon. *R. Chrétienne*, 1911, 152–161, 330–340.
Gregg (J. A. F.). The Odes of Solomon. *The Irish Church Quarterly*, January, 1913.
Gressmann (H.). Die Oden Salomos. *Christliche Welt*, 1911, 633–635, 650–652, 674–677, 703–705.
Die Oden Salomos. *Internat. Wochenschrift*, 1911, 897–908, 949–958.
In *Deutsch. Literaturzeit.*, 1911, 1349–1356, 2896–2902.
In *ZDMG.*, 1911, 850–852. See also under Gunkel.
Grimme (H.). Die neunzehnte Ode Salomos, eine Rekonstruktion. *Theologie und Glaube*, 1911, 11–18.
Die Oden Salomos, syrisch, hebräisch, deutsch. Ein kritischer Versuch. Heidelberg, 1911.

Digitized by Google

Zur Handschrift N der Oden Salomos. *Orient. Literaturzeit.*, 1912, 492–496.
In *Theologische Revue*, 1910, 545–547; 1911, 601–605.
Grosheide (F. W.). De Oden van Salomo, in *Geref. Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1916, 69–78 and 119–132.
Grützmacher (G.). In *Theologie der Gegenwart* (Leipzig), 1911, 133–136.
Guidi (J.). In *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 1911, 456–459.
Gunkel (H.). Die Oden Salomos. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1910, 291–328 (with H. Gressmann).
Die Oden Salomos. *Deutsche Rundschau*, 1913, 25–47.
In *Theolog. Literaturzeit.*, 1913, 10–13.
Hamilton (G. F.). Confirmation and the Eucharist in the Odes of Solomon, in *Irish Church Quarterly*, Oct., 1915; Jan., 1916.
The Odes of Solomon and the Pseudepigrapha, in *Internat. Journ. of Apocrypha*, 1916, 12–14.
Hansen (H.). Die Oden Salomos. *Der alte Glaube*, Hamburg, 1910, 680 f.
Die Oden Salomos, in deutschen Nachdichtungen, Gütersloh, 1911. See also under Wohlenberg.
Harnack (A.). Ein jüdisch-christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert . . . aus dem Syrischen übersetzt von J. Flemming. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von A. Harnack. In *Texte u. Untersuch.*, XXXV, 4, 1910.
In *Theol. Lit.-Zeit.*, 1912, 529.
Harris (J. R.). The Odes and Psalms of Solomon, now first published from the Syriac Version, Cambridge, 1909.
An early Christian hymn-book. *Contemp. Review*, 1909, 414–428.
An early Christian psalter, London, 1909.
An early Judaeo-Christian Hymn-book, in *The Quest*, 1910, 288–305.
Doctrine of immortality in the Odes. Cf. *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, for Oct. 24, 1913.
The Odes and Psalms of Solomon, published from the Syriac Version; second edit. revised and enlarged, with a facsimile, Cambridge, 1911.
The thirty-eighth Ode of Solomon. *Expositor*, 1911, 8 ser., 29–37.
Two flood-hymns of the early Church. *Expositor*, 1911, 405–417.
Ephrem's use of the Odes of Solomon. *Expositor*, 1912, 113–119.

Digitized by Google

Hastings (J.). In *Expository Times*, Feb., 1910 (editorial notice).

Haussleiter (J.). Der judenchristliche Character der Oden Salomos. *Theolog. Literaturblatt*, 1910, 265–276.

Headlam (A. C.). The Odes of Solomon. *Church Quart. Review*, 1911, 272–297.

Hönnicke (G.). Die neuentdeckten Oden Salomos in der bisherigen kritischen Beurteilung. *Studierstube*, Langensalza, 1911, 297–309.

Hora (E.). Die Oden Salomos. *Theologie und Glaube*, 1913, 128–140.

Jordan, *Geschichte der altchr. Literatur*. (Leipzig), 1911, p. 457.

Kennedy (H. A.). Harnack on the recently discovered Odes of Solomon. *Expository Times*, 1910, 444–446.

Kittel (G.). Eine zweite Handschrift der Oden Salomos. *Zeitsch. für neut. Wiss.*, 1913, 79–93.

Die Oden Salomos: überarbeitet oder einheitlich? Mit 2 Beilagen: I. Bibliographie der Oden Salomos, II. Syrische Konkordanz. Leipzig, 1914; also in *Theolog. Literaturblatt*, 1913, 510–515.

Kleinert (P.). Zur religionsgeschichtlichen Stellung der Oden Salomos. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1911, 569–611.

Knietschke. Die neuentdeckten Oden Salomos, in *Evang. Kirchenzeitung* (Berlin), 1911, 324–327.

Krebs (E.). Die Oden Salomos. Ein umstrittener Fund aus urchristlicher Zeit. (Kempten), 1910, 374 ff.

Spätjüdische Mystik? (*Der Logos als Heiland im ersten Jahrhundert*). Freiburg im B., 1910, 59–68.

Labourt (J.) and Batiffol (P.). Les Odes de Salomon. Une œuvre chrétienne des environs de l'an 100–120. Traduction française (p. 1–38) et introduction historique (p. 39–121). Paris, 1911. Reprint from *Revue Biblique*, 1910, 483–500; 1911, 5–59, 161–197.

Lagrange (M. J.). In *Revue Biblique*, 1910, 593–596; and 1912, 464–469.

Leendertz (J. M.). De Oden van Salomo. Amsterdam, 1910.

In *Theol. Lit.-Blatt* for Oct. 24, 1913.

Leipoldt (J.). Die Lieder Salomos. *Allgem. evang. luth. Kirchenzeit.*, 1910, 626–630.

Lejay (P.). In *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes*, 1911, 56–60.

Lindblom (J.). Om lifvets idé hos Paulus och Iohannes samt i de s. k. Salomos Oden. Upsala, 1911.

Digitized by Google

Loisy (A.). La mention du Temple dans les Odes de Salomon. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1911, 126–130.

Idem in *Revue critique*, 1911, 101–105; 1912, 343–345.

In *Revue d'histoire et de littérature*, 1911, 493–501; 1912, 524–576.

Ludwig. Ein altchristliches Gesang- und Gebetbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert. *Theologisches Prakt.* (Passau), 1911, 288–294.

Mariés (L.). La découverte des Odes de Salomon. *Études*, 1909, 807–812.

Marmorstein (A.). Kranz und Krone in den Oden Salomos. *Orient. Literaturzeit.*, 1912, 306 ff.

Marshall (J. T.). The Odes and Philo. *Expositor*, 1911, 385–398, 519–536.

Mead (G. R. S.). In *The Quest*, 1910, 561–570; ibid., 11, 166–169.

Menzies (W. A.). The Odes of Solomon. *The Interpreter*, 1910–1911, 7–22.

Mingana (A.). Quelques mots sur les Odes de Salomon. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1914, 234–253; and ibid., 1915, 167–190.

The Odes of Solomon. *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, ii, 1918 (s. v.).

Montgomery (J. A.). The recently discovered Odes of Solomon. *Biblical World*, 1910, 93–100.

Nau (F.). In *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 1910, 448; 1911, 220; and in *Journ. Asiatique*, 1913, 228.

Nestle (E.). In *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1910, 1–4; 1911, 394 and 534 f.; 1912, 202 f.; also in *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1910, 6 sq. 1912, 28 f., 492, and 586–588.

Newbold (W. R.). Bardaisan and the Odes of Solomon. *Journal of Bibl. Literature*, 1911, 161–204.

The Descent of Christ in the Odes of Solomon. *Journ. of Bibl. Liter.*, 1912, 168–209.

Perles (F.). In *Orientalist. Literaturzeit.*, 1912, 26 ff.

Plooij (D.). In *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1911–1912, De Boom der Bitterheid, 294–303; ibid., pp. 449–462: De 'Oranten'.

In *Museum* (Leiden), 1912, 148–150.

In *Expository Times*, 1912, 199–203.

Digitized by Google

In *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1913, pp. 222–231: 'Der descensus ad inferos in Aphrahat und den Oden Salomos.'

Preuschen (E.). Ein Übersetzungsfehler in den Oden Salomos. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1915, 233–235; ibid., 1910, 328.

In *Theolog. Jahresbericht* (Leipzig), 1911, XXIX, 4, p. 317; ibid., 1912, XXX, 4, p. 366.

Reinach (S.). Les Odes de Salomon. *Revue de l'hist. des religions*, 1910, 1–16, 279–294.

A propos des Odes de Salomon. *Revue moderniste internationale*, 1910, 457–458.

Sacchi (E.). Le Odi di Salomone. *Nuova Antologia*, 1911, 84–91.

Schenke (W.). De nylig fundne saakaldte Solomos oder. In *Norsk Teologisk Tidskrift* (Christiania), 1911, No. 2.

Schoen (H.). Un Psautier judéo-chrétien du premier siècle. *Mercure de France*, 1911, 774–786.

Schulthess (F.). Textkritische Bemerkungen zu den syrischen Oden Salomos. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1910, 249–258.

Schmitt (Ch.). Die 42 Oden Salomos (Trier), 1910–11, 417–422.

Smith (P.). Disciples of John and the Odes of Solomon. *Monist*, 1915, 161–199.

Spitta (F.). Zum Verständnis der Oden Salomos. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1910, 193–203, 259–290.

Die Oden Salomos. *M. für Gottesdienst und kirchl. Kunst* (Göttingen), 1910, 245–249, 273–278.

Die Oden Salomos und das Neue Testament. *M. für Pastoraltheologie*, 1910–1911, 91–101.

Sprengling (M.). Bardesanes and the Odes of Solomon. *Amer. Journal of Theology*, 1911, 459–461. Ibid., 1910, 632–637.

Staerk (W.). Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Oden Salomos. *Zeitschr. für wiss. Theologie*, 1910, 289–306. See also under Ungnad.

Stölten (W.). Gnostische Parallelen zu den Oden Salomos. *Zeitschr. für neut. Wiss.*, 1912, 29–58.

Strachan (R. H.). The newly discovered Odes of Solomon and their bearing on the problem of the Fourth Gospel. *Expository Times*, 1910–11, 7–14.

Digitized by Google

Tondelli (L.). Le Odi di Salomone. Rome, 1914.

Torm (E.). Nye Fund og deres Betydning for den nytestamentlige forskening. In *Teologisk Tidskrift* (Copenhagen), 1911, (III 2 1).

Ungnad (A.) and Staerk (W.). Die Oden Salomos aus dem Syrischen übersetzt, mit Anmerkungen. In *Kleine Texte*, 64. Bonn, 1910.

Vaccari (A.). Le Odi di Salomone. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1911, 513–528; 1912, 22–36.

Wabnitz (A.). Un Psautier judéo-chrétien du premier siècle. *Revue de théolog. et des quest. relig.*, 1910, 351–367.

Wellhausen (J.). *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1910, 629–641; 641 f.

Wensinck (A. J.). De Oden van Salomo, een oudchristelijk Psalmboek. *Theologische Studien* (Utrecht), 1911, 1–60.

Ephrem's hymns of Epiphany and the Odes of Solomon. *Expositor*, 1912, 108–112.

Willey (R. H. D.). The Odes and Psalms of Solomon. *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1913, 293–298.

Wohlenberg (G.) and Hansen (H.) In *Schleswig-Holstein-Lauenburgisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt*, 1910, 45, 47, 69, 81, 93, 105, 113, 125, 477, 489.

Worrell (W. H.). The Odes of Solomon and the Pistis Sophia. *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, 1911, 29–45.

Zahn (T.). Die Oden Salomos. *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschr.*, 1910, 667–701, 747–777.

Zarin (S. M.). The newly discovered apocryphal writings: The Odes of Solomon (Russian title) in *Hristianskoe Čtenie* (Petrograd), 1912, 601–626.

Zwaan (J. de). Een dichter uit den tijd der Apostolische vaders. *Onze eeuw* (Haarlem), 1911, 223–246.

Ignatius and the Odist. *Amer. Journ. of Theology*, 1911, 617–625.

In *Museum*, July, 1916, 311–315.

To the above list must be added the following Reviews, Notices, and Announcements of discovery of the Odes:

Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, 6 May, 1909 (J. M. Leendertz).

Kirchlicher Anzeiger für Würtemberg, No. 49, 1909 (E. Nestle).

Digitized by Google

Sitzungsberichte d. königｇ. preuss. Akademie, No. 51, 1909 (A. Harnack).
Times Literary Supplement, 2 Dec. 1909.
The Record, 17 Dec. 1909.
Rivista storico-critica delle scienze teol., Nr. 7 and 8, 1910 (U. Manucci).
The Christian World, 13 Jan. 1910.
The Methodist Times, 13 Jan. 1910 (W. B. Brash).
The Athenaeum, 1910, 62–63; 1912, 517.
The British Friend, Jan. 1910 (R. S. Franks).
The British Weekly, 24 Feb. 1910 (J. Moffatt), and 27 April.
The Outlook, 2 April, 1910.
The Evening Bulletin, 13 April, 1910.
The Guardian, 14, 29 April, 3 June, 1910 (Nairne).
Great Thoughts, 7 May, 1910.
The Churchman, Oct. 1910.
The Amer. Methodist Quart. Review, Oct. 1910, and Jan. 1911.
The Biblical World, 1910, 142 (Goodspeed), and 432.
Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 1910, 623.
Revue moderniste, 1910, 418.
Revue de l'histoire des religions, 1910, 109.
Revue des questions historiques, 1911.
The Evening Bulletin, 13 April, 1910.
The Daily News, 11 March, 1910.
Presbyterian Banner, 2 June, 1910 (D. S. Schaff).
Theolog. Rundschau; Nov. 1910 (W. Bousset).
Theolog. Literaturz., 1910, 6 f. (E. Schürer).
Theolog. Literaturbericht, 1910, 304–306 (Riggenbach).
Literarisches Zentralblatt, 1910, 777–781 (G. Kr.).
Literarische Rundschau, 1911, 153 f. (B. Hake).
Theolog. Tijdschrift, 1911, 89–92 (K. Lake).
Revue of Theology and Phil., 1911, 334 (V. Bartlet), and July, 1912 (T. H. Weir).
Studierstube (Langensalza), 1911, No. 10 (J. Böhmer).
Revue historique, 1911, 101; 1912, 338 (C. Guignebert).
Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 1911, 185 and 603; 1912 (L. Gougaud), and p. 386 (C. Mohlberg).
The American Journal of Theology, 1911, 322.

Digitized by Google

Bulletin d'ancienne littérat. et d'arch. chrétienne, 1911, 152 (J. Labourt).
Le Lien (Marseilles), Nov.–Dec. 1911 (Bruston).
Theologie und Glaube, 1911, 858 (B. Bartmann), and 592 (Peters).
The Irish Theolog. Quart., 1911, 498 f. (J. MacCaffrey).
Revue Bénédictine, 1911, 449 f. (J. de Puniet).
Écho d'Orient, 1911, 370 (S. Salaville).
Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theologie, 1912, 263 (Windisch).
Historisches Jahrbuch (Munich), 1912, 157 (A. G.).
Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature, 1913, 263 (J. B. Chabot).
Nederlandsche Kerkbode, 1911, July 29 and Aug. 5 (P.).
Analecta Bollandiana, 1911, tom. xxx, fasc. ii–iii, p. 332 (H. Delahaye).
The Expository Times, 1912, 75.
The Westminster Review for Jan. 25, 1913.
Abst. Journ. Society of Hist. Theol. for 1911–1912. (A. Büchler on Ode xi, and V. Bartlet on E. A. Abbott and the Odes.)
Journal of Theol. Studies, 1914, 454 (H. M. Slee).

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE

HOME USE
CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
MAIN LIBRARY

This book is due on the last date stamped below.
1-month loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405.
6-month loans may be recharged by bringing books to Circulation Desk.
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date.
ALL BOOKS ARE SUBJECT TO RECALL 7 DAYS AFTER DATE CHECKED OUT.

DAVIS
INTERLIBRARY LOAN

DEC 3 1975

DEC 02 1998

LD21—A-40m-8,'75
(S7737L)

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

Digitized by Google

YD 26317

442249

Bible
BS 1830
P7S8
1916
v.2

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Digitized by Google